

ANGLO- SOVIET JOURNAL

CONTENTS

Special Psychology & Psychiatry Issue

- | | |
|---|----------------------|
| Soviet Psychology | Brian Kirman |
| Foundations of Soviet and Western Psychiatry | John McLeish |
| Pavlov and the Gestalt and Associationist Schools | E. G. Vatsuro |
| Moscow's New Buildings and Their Builders | Ralph Parker |
| Trade Union Activity in Soviet Factories: 2 | <i>from KLUB</i> |
| The Writer and the Construction Schemes | Alexei Surkov |
| The Builders of Kakhovka | V. Druzhinin |
| A Difficult Position: <i>story</i> | M. Edel |
| Soviet Economy: <i>review</i> | Maurice Dobb |

AND BOOK REVIEWS, ETC.

✓
B.L.P. in Ser. 70

VOLUME XIII ∞ NUMBER 1

**SPRING
1952**

TWO SHILLINGS & SIXPENCE

SCR

14 KENSINGTON SQUARE, LONDON, W.8. WESTERN 1571

OFFICERS, 1950-51

<i>President</i>	SIR CHARLES TREVELYAN, BT., P.C.
<i>Chairman</i>	D. N. PRITT, Q.C.
<i>Hon. Treasurer</i>	A. W. L. KESSEL, M.C., M.B.E., F.R.C.S.
<i>Secretary</i>	MISS JUDITH TODD, B.A.
<i>Organiser</i>	CHRISTOPHER FREEMAN, B.Sc.(ECON.)

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE—Dudley Collard, Dr. Horace Joules, Arthur Ling, A.R.I.B.A., Miss Mary Merrall, The Hon. Ivor Montagu, Prof. L. S. Penrose, D. T. Richnell, Gordon Sandison, Cdr. E. P. Young, R.N. (ret'd.), Prof. C. L. Wrenn.

ARCHITECTURE AND PLANNING GROUP.—*Chairman*: Arthur Ling, A.R.I.B.A., A.M.T.P.I. *Committee*: A. W. Barr, A.R.I.B.A., Bertram Carter, F.R.I.B.A., Welis Coates, O.B.E., F.R.I.B.A., Miss Elizabeth Denby, HON. A.R.I.B.A., R. I. Greatrex, A.R.I.B.A., J. Howe, A.R.I.B.A., J. D. Kay, B. Lubetkin, Colin Penn, A.R.I.B.A., John Pinkheard, A.R.I.B.A., Peter Shephard, B.A.R.C.H., A.R.I.B.A., A.M.T.P.I., Gordon Stephenson, F.R.I.B.A.

CHESS SECTION.—*President*: Prof. L. S. Penrose. *Vice-Presidents*: I. R. Vesselo, William Winter, B. H. Wood. *Council*: W. A. Fairhurst, J. Gilchrist, H. Golombek, H. M. Lommer, Kingsley Martin, Julius Silverman, M.P., Miss Eileen Tranmer.

EDUCATION SECTION.—*President*: Lady Simon of Wythenshawe. *Vice-Presidents*: Miss D. E. M. Gardner, G. D. B. Gray, Prof. M. L. Jacks, Dr. G. B. Jeffery, F.R.S., Prof. J. A. Lauwerys, Prof. V. de S. Pinto, Dr. Janet Vaughan, Dame Olive Wheeler. *Chairman*: Mrs. Beatrice King. *Committee*: *Representatives from*—The Association of Headmistresses, The Assistant Mistresses Association, The Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education, The Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters, The English New Education Fellowship, The Modern Language Association.

FILM SECTION.—*President*: Sir Laurence Olivier. *Chairman*: Roger Livesey. *Committee*: Anthony Asquith, Ralph Bond, Arthur Calder-Marshall, Basil Dearden, Sir Arthur Elton, Bt., Sidney Gilliat, Alfred Junge, Gavin Lambert, Frank Launder, Vivien Leigh, Dr. Roger Manvell, Ivor Montagu, Ronald Neame, Michael Powell, Sir Ralph Richardson, Paul Rotha, R. C. Sherriff, Harry Watt, Graham Woodford, Basil Wright.

LEGAL SECTION.—*Chairman*: Dudley Collard. *Hon. Sec.*: T. Whitty. *Committee*: Lord Chorley, J. B. Elton, J. Gaster, A. Kiralfy, R. Simon, M. Wilenkin.

MUSIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—Alan Bush, Victor Carne, Edward Clark, Scott Goddard, Julian Herbage, Thomas Russell (London Philharmonic Orchestra), Prof. Edward Dent, Dr. John Ireland, Rutland Boughton.

SCIENCE ADVISORY COUNCIL.—Prof. J. D. Bernal, F.R.S., Prof. P. M. S. Blackett, F.R.S., Lord Boyd-Orr, F.R.S., Dr. Julian Huxley, F.R.S., Dr. Dorothy Needham, F.R.S., Prof. D. H. Smyth, Sir Robert Watson-Watt, F.R.S. *Chairman of Medical Committee*: A. W. L. Kessel, F.R.C.S.

THEATRE SECTION.—*President*: Sir Lewis Casson. *Vice-Presidents*: Peggy Ashcroft, John Burrell, Joseph Macleod, Dame Sybil Thorndike, Dame Ninette de Valois. *Hon. Treasurer*: Mary Merrall. *Committee*: Sir Kenneth Barnes, Peter Brook, Lawrance Collingwood, C.B.E., Peter Copley, George Devine, Rachel Kempson, Martin Lawrence, Beatrix Lehmann, Margaret Leighton, Miles Malleon, Herbert Marshall, Oscar Quitak, Michael Redgrave, Llewellyn Rees, John Ruddock, Gordon Sandison, R. D. Smith, Gwynneth L. Thurburn.

WRITERS' GROUP.—*President*: Compton Mackenzie, O.B.E., LL.D. *Chairman*: Prof. C. L. Wrenn. *Committee*: James Aldridge, Adrian Brunel, Mrs. Cecil Chesterton, O.B.E., Roy Fuller, Jack Lindsay, James MacGibbon, David Magarshack, Bertha Malnick, PH.D., Iris Morley, Montagu Slater, L. A. G. Strong, Julian Symons, Dylan Thomas, Alick West.

THE ANGLO-SOVIET JOURNAL

The Anglo-Soviet Journal is the quarterly organ of the Society for Cultural Relations between the Peoples of the British Commonwealth and the USSR.

The Society is a non-political organisation founded in 1924 to diffuse information in both countries on developments in science, education, art, literature, and social and economic life.

The SCR organises lectures, concerts, film shows, playreadings, exhibitions and so on, and has the largest collection of information in Britain on cultural aspects of the USSR. It carries on these activities largely through its specialised bodies, the *Architecture and Planning Group*, the *Chess Section*, the *Education Section*, the *Film Section*, the *Legal Section*, the *Music Section*, the *Science Section*, the *Theatre Section*, the *Translators' Group*, the *Writers' Group*, and a number of working committees on other subjects.

The SCR Library contains nearly 10,000 volumes in English and in Russian and is a comprehensive source of authoritative information on Soviet cultural matters, as is also the Exhibition Department as regards pictorial and display material.

Members of the SCR are entitled to borrow books from the Library and to take out subscriptions to the *Anglo-Soviet Journal* at a reduced rate; at many of the Society's functions there is a reduced admission fee for members. The basic subscription to the Society is 10s. 6d. a year (students and country members 5s.).

EDITOR *Andrew Rothstein, M.A.*

ASSISTANT EDITOR *Stella Jackson, B.A.*

Editorial Office:

14 Kensington Square, London, W.8

Telephone: WEStern 1571

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
NIKOLAI GOGOL - - - - -	3
SOVIET PSYCHOLOGY AND PSYCHIATRY :	
1. Soviet Psychology - - - - - <i>Brian Kirman</i>	4
2. Pavlov and the Gestalt and Associationist Schools of Psychology - - - - - <i>E. G. Vatsuro</i>	9
3. Foundations of Soviet and Western Psychiatry - <i>John McLeish</i>	17
TRADE UNION ACTIVITY IN SOVIET FACTORIES, 2 (from <i>KLUB</i>) :	
1. How We Work with Our Readers - - <i>T. Yemelianova</i>	22
2. Cultural Work at a Great Building Job - - <i>F. Voshchenko</i>	24
3. Give Us More Good and Varied Plays - - - - - (<i>Open Letter to Playwrights from the Trekhgornaya Textile Combine</i>)	27
A DIFFICULT POSITION (<i>Story</i>) - - - - - <i>M. Edel</i>	29
THE WRITERS' ATTITUDE :	
1. The Writer and the Construction Schemes - - <i>Alexei Surkov</i>	33
2. The Builders of Kakhovka - - - - - <i>V. Druzhinin</i>	38
MOSCOW'S NEW BUILDINGS AND THEIR BUILDERS (<i>ASJ Moscow Letter</i>) - - - - - <i>Ralph Parker</i>	41
SOVIET ECONOMY, by Harry Schwartz (<i>Review- article</i>) - - - - - <i>Maurice Dobb</i>	46
BOOK REVIEWS - - - - -	49
(<i>Anton Chekhov, Selected Short Stories; Geography of the USSR; Land in Bloom; Peter and the Wolf; Six Short Stories; The Achievements of Soviet Economics in the First Post-war Five-year Plan Period; The Great Construction Works of Communism; The Russian Folk Epos in Czech Literature; The Soviet Trade Unions during the period of the Post-war Five-year Plan; The World Chess Championship, Botvinnik v. Bronstein</i>)	
PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED - - - - -	54
SCR NOTES - - - - -	55

ANGLO-SOVIET JOURNAL

Annual subscription 10s. post free (SCR members 8s. 6d.). Single copies 2s. 6d. (post 3d.). Back numbers available.

Editorial Office :

14 Kensington Square, London, W.8

Telephone : WEstern 1571

Readers are invited to submit communications—if possible not more than 2,000 words in length—by the middle of January, April, July and October for the spring, summer, autumn and winter issues respectively.

NIKOLAI GOGOL

1809 - 1852

THE centenary of the death of the great Russian satirist Nikolai Gogol is being widely celebrated in the USSR. A special committee was set up to arrange the great commemoration meeting in Moscow on March 4. Since last December the daily, weekly and monthly press has been full of material on Gogol, the periodicals concerned ranging from children's magazines to learned journals and the national dailies, and the material including the following:

ZATEINIK, 1, 1952 (a children's magazine): extracts from Gogol's works (with songs, dances, music) suitable for use in dramatised form with make-up and costume at children's matinee performances; advice on staging from a professional theatre producer.

ZATEINIK, 2, 1952: pictures of boys in costume as characters from "Dead Souls"; sketches of famous characters from other Gogol works; a dramatised sketch from "Dead Souls."

RUSSKI YAZIK V SHKOLE, 1, 1952 ("Russian In Schools": a bi-monthly journal): special feature showing the importance of Gogol's contribution to the Russian literary language, his use of proverbs, his notebooks on country speech, his humour, irony, lyricism and satire.

LITERATURA V SHKOLE, 6, 1951 ("Literature In Schools"): a long list of excerpts from Gogol's works suitable for school and out-of-school use by children; some interesting figures (see below).

OKTYABR, 1, 1952 ("October": a monthly literary journal): an article on Gogol's importance to the theatre of his day.

Articles in other journals deal with Pushkin's influence on Gogol and his on Nekrassov.

PUBLICATION FIGURES

In 1952 alone nearly 7,500,000 copies of Gogol's works are to be published in the USSR. These include a complete edition to contain over a thousand letters, and also a five-volume selected edition, both from the USSR Academy of Sciences. The State Literature Publishing House is to issue a six-volume edition in 4,000,000 copies, and there are to be a number of one-volume illustrated editions. Apart from these Russian editions, 1,000,000 copies of works by Gogol are to be published in thirteen languages in 1952; these include a six-volume selected edition in Armenian, a three-volume edition in Ukrainian, and translations into Lithuanian, Azerbaijanian and so on. Pre-Soviet and Soviet figures are: 1887-1917, in five nationality languages, 5,813,000 copies of works by Gogol; 1917-1951, in thirty-five nationality languages, 18,000,000 copies.

In addition, a large number of posters in a series of six are to appear, and two films are planned. Theatres from Moscow to Baku, Tbilisi and Central Asia are to perform Gogol's plays, and special exhibitions—in the Moscow Literary Museum and in Gogol's Ukrainian birthplace—are in preparation.

SOVIET PSYCHOLOGY

By Brian Kirman

"WITH me on the contrary [cf. Hegel] the idea is nothing else than the material world reflected by the human mind, and translated into forms of thought." (Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Preface to the 2nd Edition.)

"CONTRARY to metaphysics, dialectics does not regard nature as an accidental agglomeration of things, of phenomena, unconnected with, isolated from, and independent of each other, but as a connected and integral whole, in which things, phenomena are organically connected with, dependent on, and determined by, each other." (J. V. Stalin, *Leninism*.)

THESE two quotations illustrate the two principles in materialism and dialectics which determine the attitude of Marxists to psychology. An understanding of the application of these two principles is necessary for the student in Britain or America to realise the fundamental differences between Soviet psychology and that accepted in his country. The difference is not essentially of the method of study, e.g. between behaviourism and the Pavlovian school, or of the application of psychology, e.g. between leucotomy and Soviet methods of sleep therapy for psychoses. The overall and fundamentally important difference is in the nature of the very subject of study, that is in Soviet man himself. Thus, to quote Zhdanov: "Each day our people rise higher and higher. We are not the same today as we were yesterday and we will not be the same tomorrow as we are today. We are not the same Russians we were before 1917, and Russia is not the same, and our nature is not the same. We have changed and grown along with the vast changes that have completely changed the face of our country."

Soviet psychologists are of course whole-hearted materialists. They believe with Marx that the human mind is but a reflection of the outside world and as such is fully knowable, not only in its expressed ideational content and form but also in its physiological aspect by means of which it is brought into being phylogenetically and ontogenetically, by social and individual forces.

As dialecticians, however, they are not mechanical materialists. They do not believe that the brain is a penny-in-the-slot machine. They do not deny any more than did Pavlov the importance of conscious thought. (Thus Pavlov stated: "Psychology is a formulation of the phenomena of our subjective world—a completely legitimate matter—and it would be idle to quarrel with this. On this basis we act, on this basis is composed the whole of social and personal life, there can be no question about this. Discussion is confined to the analysis of the subjective world. Of course a psychological analysis must be regarded as insufficient in view of its fruitless efforts over thousands of years to study and analyse the higher nervous system. But psychology, as a study of the reflection of reality, as the subjective world, linked in a well-known manner defined by general formulae—that is, naturally, an unavoidable matter. Thanks to psychology I am able to imagine the complexity of data of a subjective nature.") In this respect they differ completely from the behaviourists. They attach extreme significance to the complicated individual and social "superstructure". They realise that available knowledge is at present much too limited to permit of a simple explanation of complicated psychological processes at the higher levels of ideation and that the action of the psychological "superstructure" on the economic and social environment is as important as the opposite effect.

From this it follows that the tremendous changes which have taken place in the Soviet Union during the thirty-four years since the fall of the Kerensky regime in every aspect of economic, social and political organisation are reflected in the psychology of the Soviet people. The process of change is a continuous and constant one. It is, however, also incomplete and imperfect. The stages of economic development through which the Soviet Union has passed must be reflected in the minds of the people. Just as there is a socialist level of industrial organisation which has now been attained: just as the Soviet people are now moving forward to the building of economic communism as exemplified by the "Great Projects", so in the psychological sphere we may recognise a socialist psychology and may look forward to the emergence of "Communist Man". Whilst stating that the mind is a reflection of external reality and emphasising the two-way dialectical relationship between the psychological superstructure and the economic foundation of society, Marxism-Leninism (which is accepted as basic by Soviet psychologists) does not suggest that the reflected image is perfect or that the relationship is not infinitely complex and delicate. (See Lenin on absolute and relative truth.) An example of the physiological basis for this lack of perfection is to be found in the fact that the limitations of the cerebral analysers in dogs revealed by Pavlov's relatively simple experiments are paralleled by similar limitations in humans. It is also clear on the basis of another law of dialectics—that governing change—that there is not only an imperfection in the mental image of an actual situation at any given time—but also that there is a similar inadequacy in mental representation of changes over the course of time. The socially and politically important aspect of this phenomenon is twofold: on the one hand there is ideological conservatism, on the other ideological progress—ahead of the stage reached by economy and by society. The latter is of course the specifically human attribute of imagination and planning, the ability to dream creative day-dreams, the social importance of which Gorky fully realised, as shown by the following passage from *Childhood*, written in 1913.

"Sometimes when I recall the abominations of that barbarous Russian life I question whether they are worth dwelling on. But on further consideration I am convinced that they demand exposure, for they are the vicious, tenacious truth, which has not been exterminated to this very day. They represent a truth which must be laid bare to the roots and torn out of our grim and shameful life—torn out of the very soul and memory of man.

"But there is another, more positive reason impelling me to describe such horrors. In spite of the repulsiveness of such things and the way in which they mutilate what would otherwise be fine natures, the Russian is sufficiently young and wholesome in spirit to abolish them, and he will surely do so.

"Our life is amazing not only for the vigorous scum of bestiality with which it is overgrown, but also for the bright and wholesome creative forces gleaming beneath. And the influence of good is growing, giving promise that our people will at last awaken to a life full of beauty and bright humanity."

It was the effective organisation of those who, like Gorky, had a sanguine conviction of the creative possibilities of human nature that achieved such apparent miracles as the triumph of the Soviet forces in the revolution, the civil war, the wars of intervention and the Great Patriotic War, and enabled them to triumph over even more formidable obstacles of an economic and psychological nature. The Bolshevik of the 1917-1922 period fought under the slogan of "Peace and Bread", and for years he had neither bread nor peace. The Soviet worker of 1928-1940 sacrificed his month's wages for investment in the five-year plans so that he might have money to spend and goods to buy. The Soviet soldier of 1940-1945 fought for the Soviet way of life, for culture, leisure, freedom for individual development, for his collective farm or his factory, for his home, at a time when cultural development was slowed down.

leisure destroyed, individual freedom sacrificed to the exigencies of war, at a time when his collective farm was devastated or his factory razed to the ground.

The quality, then, of Bolshevik optimism, which is the guarantee of the ultimate victory of socialism and of communism, is but the canalisation and development of qualities latent in all humans and in all societies. It enables the leading cadres of the working people to struggle forward and to take the people with them at a time when no material reward can as yet be anticipated. It is the quality that underlies Soviet realism in art in all its forms and that prevents such art from being merely a passive reflection of external forms and converts it into a powerful instrument for fashioning a new and better society.

The opposite trend in human psychology to that which engenders Bolshevik optimism is conservatism, living in the past, reluctance to discard shibboleths. The struggle for the building of socialism is conducted not only on the military and economic battle-front but also in the mind of man. The battle of ideas rages no less furiously in the Soviet Union than in capitalist countries. As witnessed for example by what has become known in English as "the Lysenko Controversy" on genetics, by the wave of criticism of Marr in linguistics which culminated in Stalin's historic articles, and by similar radical reviews of attainments and shortcomings of music and art generally.

A guarantee of the lasting stability of the change in the mind of Soviet man is provided by the economic and social changes which have taken place in the Soviet Union. Rich grain harvests and the abolition of famine, prosperity and the disappearance of pestilence, peace and the end of apparently interminable cold and misery. These are some of the obvious material rewards which attach to the new way of life. Equally important in determining mental attitudes is the monolithic structure of the Soviet State. The abolition of racial, sex or class inequality which followed the October revolution, the sense of unity, of belonging, of social value, of being the most important of all society's possessions, this was the cement that bound together the heterogeneous social components of the young Union and rendered it impervious to the most violent destructive forces that could be unleashed by world reaction.

Soviet society may be visualised as a series of collectives in each of which the individual is provided with the fullest opportunities for development of his own personality and is at the same time guarded against indignity and exploitation. In each of these he shares, as an equal, not only rights but also duties. The home, the school, the place of work—on these are based the origin of major types of collective, to these are added political and other types of collective unit. In all of these collective groups there goes on vigorous criticism and self-criticism paralleling that which has recently taken place in the field of psychology proper—the Chernakhov critique of Rubinstein, the Pavlovian session of the Academies, the recent discussion on leucotomy followed by its prohibition, the criticism of Orbeli, and so on.

It is implicit in these considerations that there must be in contemporary Soviet psychology a large remnant of bourgeois ideology. This derives historically from the simple fact that many leading Soviet intellectuals grew up before the revolution and were naturally much influenced by the ideological climate in which they then lived. The recent novel *Steel and Slag*, by Popov, is one of a series of "psychological" novels dealing with different aspects of this conflict showing the impact of new ideas upon the old in one collective, that of the workshop. There is no question of industrial psychology as a separate discipline in the Soviet Union: but this novel may be looked upon to some extent as a portrayal of human relations in industry. Rotov, the director of the steelworks, is shown as the good, conscientious, knowledgeable, technically efficient engineer who has, however, one vital failing, a neglect of the importance of the personal touch in management, in his relationships with his fellow workers. In Soviet industry the basic conflict in capitalist industry—

the clash of class interests—has been abolished in economic fact, but its psychological reflection has not yet been abolished from the mind of man. Many conflicts persist at a psychological level and Popov attempts to portray the solution of some of these, showing us that it was by the successful resolution of these contradictions that the Soviet Union was able to overcome almost single-handed an enemy with every material advantage. In applying the word “psychological” to this new type of Soviet novel I do not wish to compare it with the dreary subjective meanderings of a whole epoch of German scribblers who dabbled in semi-technical psychological jargon. Rather it portrays, in the best tradition of great writers such as Tolstoy and Dickens, the process of character-formation in conditions of contemporary Soviet society.

Mention has already been made of the fact that in the Soviet Union practical psychology is not a matter for psychologists only. Similarly there is no such thing in that country as “pure” psychology. There are sound theoretical and practical reasons for this. Following the revolution and other military and civil disturbances, a number of social tasks of huge magnitude faced the Soviet government. As already outlined, the successful accomplishment of all these tasks depended on psychological factors. This was clearly however no matter for academic psychologists such as there were in Russia at that time, but primarily for those leaders of the working class and peasantry who had manifested the ability for leadership, i.e. their ability as practical psychologists to understand the minds and desires of the people whom they were leading and to appraise the obstacles which confronted the new regime in the light of the material and psychological resources at their disposal. This was true in the general field of party work, in party education and propaganda. The development of new political cadres could not be separated from the growth of technique, and the success of the whole experiment in socialism was dependent on this. In the field of school and college education as distinct from general party and industrial education there was also a tremendous practical problem, the conversion of a largely illiterate and mainly peasant population into a nation of cultured socialists. This could only be done by throwing wide the gates of all scholastic institutions to the children of the working class and the complete abandonment of an educational technique designed for the offspring of the bourgeoisie. The new Soviet educational science was derived from the practical lessons of experience with this huge mass of human material and control of this science has remained firmly in the hands of the teachers, who have resisted all efforts by educational psychologists, approaching the subject from an academic angle, to intrude into this field.

There has been on the part of Soviet educationists a particularly sharp attack on test psychology. This is understandable in view of Bolshevik optimism, which we have just considered, and also of the new situation mentioned above where daily apparent miracles of education are being performed as described by Makarenko in his *Pedagogicheskaya Poema* (Teacher's Epic). Many of the outstanding Soviet intellectuals of today began their lives as ragged, illiterate urchins, by orthodox standards most unpromising material. The post-revolutionary standards were however not orthodox, as illustrated by Makarenko in his *Road to Life*.

This is not to say however that Marxist socialism, on the basis of which contemporary Soviet psychology is founded, denies the existence of individual psychological differences, whether these be genetically or environmentally acquired. On the contrary, the essence of the revolutionary doctrine is that the improvement in material and cultural circumstances resulting from the change towards Communism will result in a heightened development of individual potentialities often completely latent in contemporary capitalist society. Lenin has dealt ably with this form of crude vulgarisation of socialism by latter-day “levellers”. At the end of the post-revolutionary period in Soviet

education, a modified examination system of a new type was introduced. This was not done on the basis that some children were necessarily inferior but that owing to economic limitations of the time opportunities were not available to provide higher education for all. It was recognised however that this was a temporary phase and a continuous development in educational facilities has taken place since then (apart from the damage inflicted during the Nazi occupation) and further big expansions are envisaged for the future. Soviet teachers do not consider themselves limited by the intelligence quotient of their pupils but only by shortage of places in schools; shortage of teachers, of paper, of books and other material. It should be remembered that the population of the Soviet Union is 200,000,000 and that this is a young population with a high proportion of children, also that in 1928, at the beginning of the first five-year plan (only twenty-three years ago), a majority of the people of that vast country lived on small individual peasant holdings in conditions of considerable backwardness. This fact, and with the war, will explain why it is only now that a compulsory seven-years' system of education for all has been introduced in the villages. The Bolsheviks see then in Soviet youth an inexhaustible well of talent with limitless creative possibilities. In a text-book of the psychology of children by Leontyeva and Bozhovik published in Moscow in 1950 the authors devote much more space to the *motives* which influence a child in his school-work than to any innate limitation of abilities. They state: "... motives of study have a highly complicated and individual character: they depend on the formation of the character of the child, on the attitude to study and school that has been inculcated in him.

"Motives of study do not develop accidentally or spontaneously. At each stage of development they have their special laws which set particular tasks for the educational system. The teacher must know the psychological peculiarities of the motives of study of the children of the age with which he is working and also interest himself in the individual features of the study of motivation of each child. Only thus can he so construct his educational work with the children that it guarantees the creation in them of such motives in study as are essential for their success at school." Soviet psychology does not accept the view that intelligence is an abstraction unconditioned by the environment and as such unalterable, any more than Lysenko is willing to accept the doctrine of the immutability of the germ plasm.

An additional reason for the radical change in the nature of Soviet psychological science after the revolution was provided by the fact that, as in other sciences, a considerable number of the practitioners left the country together with the ruling class with which they were connected. This imposed additional hardship at the time but facilitated the complete overhaul of science and the creation of scientific theory on a new materialist basis coupled with practical tasks. Even so there remained much bourgeois influence in Soviet intellectual life, as was natural. It is interesting to note that scientific controversy did not gradually cease and die away after the revolution but on the contrary rages ever more hotly. This is in harmony with the Marxist teaching that the tempo of revolutionary development, whether in economic affairs or in psychology, does not slacken off at the moment of taking power but proceeds at an ever-increasing rate. Frank and outspoken criticism occurs not only between the scientists of "East" and "West" but is most intense within the Soviet Union, as exemplified by the recent linguistic controversy.

It is axiomatic that in science theory can only be soundly based on extensive practice. Darwin propounded his theory of evolution as a result of a vast amount of observation and experience. Pavlov did not put forward his theories on conditioned reflexes until he could support them with experiments which could be repeated by any competent physiologist. It is not surprising therefore that (in view of Soviet rejection of metaphysics and armchair theorising, which

have played so large a role in psychology in other countries, including the instinct psychology of Freud and McDougall) Soviet psychologists are only now in the process of evolving their own psychological theory, based on a tremendous experience of creative work in the school, in industry, in the army, and evidenced by the flowering of a new Soviet culture. A fundamental difference in the nature of Soviet and non-Soviet psychology lies in their scope and application. In other countries a great deal of "psychology" is devoted to the explaining away of phenomena which do not fit in with the psychology of the ruling class in politics, history, economics and the like, but in the Soviet Union the unity of the economic and psychological aspects of phenomena (with the priority of the former) is recognised, so that criminality for example cannot in that country be either "explained" or "condoned" on a psychological basis, but is acknowledged as revealing shortcomings in the educational and social system, a legacy from previous class-relationships in society.

In evolving a new theoretical basis for Soviet psychology, then, to what source must the psychologists of the new generation turn? The old authorities have proved sterile. As consistent materialists the Soviet psychologists closely ally their work with that of the physiologists, in particular with the work of the successors of I. P. Pavlov. However, they condemn mechanical materialism and the notion of narrow localisation of cerebral function which automatically opens the way to leucotomy and destructive "psycho-surgery". The study of evolution, of comparative morphology of the nervous system, and of the biological, economic and sociological development of man, finds a place in the new text-book of psychology. The main source of understanding of human psychology is however the direct approach to man himself, to the new socialist relations of individuals as exemplified in "that which is growing and being born" in the work of the best and most successful teachers, in the activities of leading Stakhanovites, the Heroes of Socialist Labour, the people of the new epoch. These people in their mental stature tower above and dominate even the great projects of Communism to which they have given birth.

PAVLOV AND THE GESTALT AND ASSOCIATIONIST SCHOOLS OF PSYCHOLOGY

By E. G. Vatsuro, *Doctor of Biology*

IN the process of mastering the theories of genius of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, Soviet science, in its different branches, is ridding itself resolutely of every reactionary and conservative element which is holding back the tempo of its progressive development.

The victories of the Michurinist trend in biology and of Pavlov's teaching in medicine are a triumph of true science, equipped with an unsurpassed method of understanding the laws of the objective world—the method of materialist dialectics. However, it would be a great mistake to say that all branches of Soviet science have been subjected to a critical examination and freed from contamination by elements of a decayed conservatism:

One such branch of science which, up to the present time, preserves elements of profound conservatism in its system of theoretical propositions is contemporary psychology. And this is the more surprising in that it is precisely to Russian genius—to the genius of Sechenov and Pavlov—that world science

is indebted for the discovery of the necessary prerequisites for the construction of a genuinely scientific materialist psychology.

Naturally it does not follow from this that our Soviet psychology has in general made no attempts at revaluation and revision of its previous position and has not striven to master the method of dialectical materialism, with the aim of building a new theoretical system for the generalisation of the factual material at its disposal. However, it must be frankly admitted that these attempts have so far failed to produce the necessary results. The reason for this springs in the first place from the fact that contemporary psychology has not only not so far mastered the materialist teaching of Pavlov, but, in some strange way, regarded it as one of the different forms of the old association school.

A negative attitude to the theory of association was imparted to psychology by the new trend in German psychology, which received the name of "Gestalt psychology". This trend, based on the principles of idealist philosophy, put forward a falsely interpreted principle of wholeness, which it counterpoised to the atomism of the old psychological trend, dismissing this as "brick psychology". In this way there developed the apparent alternatives; either the analytical atomism of the old associationists, or synthetic structural psychology, with its idealist conceptions of the principle of wholeness (Gestalt psychology).

It is necessary to point out that it was Pavlov himself who first pointed out the illusory nature of the alternative choice, by showing that the recognition of the principle of wholeness, rightly conceived, that is conceived in a materialist sense, in no way contradicts acceptance at the same time of the principle of the association theory (see Pavlov, *Physiology and Pathology of Higher Nervous Activity*, p. 35, 1930).

However, this did not serve as a basis for eliminating the misunderstanding which had arisen, and our contemporary psychology found itself in a state of covert antagonism to the basic principles of the Pavlovian scientific concepts, and hence to the essence of the whole of Pavlov's materialist teaching.

The question of the recognition or non-recognition by psychologists of the principle of association, or, in other words, of the principle of temporary linkages, is one of the cardinal questions on the solution of which, in practice, depends the future of psychology as a genuine materialist science, and together with it the future of psycho-pathology in its Pavlovian sense.

In the last years of his life, Pavlov especially emphasised the importance of psychology for psychopathology and psychiatry. "It is useful to recognise", said Pavlov at a "Wednesday" (i.e. one of his regular Wednesday discussion meetings with his staff), "that it is inevitable and essential that the psychiatrist should be a psychologist . . .". However, dissatisfaction with the systems of theoretical generalisation existing in psychology obliged Pavlov to conclude the sentence quoted above with the words "even though in an empirical fashion". (*Pavlov's Wednesdays*, Vol. 2, p. 415).

As is well known, Pavlov never denied the necessity of the existence of psychology as an independent science, but he constantly attacked the ideological basis of the psychology of his time with its "adeterministic tendencies". "Psychology", he often said on his Wednesdays, "as a study of the reflection of reality, as a subjective world, conforming to general formulae in a known manner, is, of course, an essential thing. Thanks to psychology I am able to imagine the complexity of the given subjective state." (Op. cit., p. 416).

At the same time he considered it absolutely essential to "fertilise" psychology with the data provided by physiological research, i.e., in other words, to set it upon a new, materialistic basis.

By means of his teaching on higher nervous activity, Pavlov proposed

providing psychologists with a "firm ground, a natural system for the basic phenomena studied by them, by which it would be easier for them to reduce to order the endless chaos of human experiences." (Pavlov, *The Experience of 20 Years*, p. 535.)

But in spite of the consistent striving of I. P. Pavlov to establish friendly and practical contact between the representatives of the two disciplines, his fine materialist teaching appeared foreign to the basic line of development of psychology, which occupied a completely independent position in relation to the fundamental principles of the great physiologist's conception.

In order to reveal the true position of contemporary Soviet psychology and its relation to Pavlovian scientific concepts, let us consider, on the one hand, the representatives of psychology, and Pavlov on the other, in relation to certain general theoretical propositions of principle.

Let us begin with the cardinal propositions of the materialist teaching of Pavlov. It is generally known that the proposition which is basic to the Pavlovian concepts is the principle of temporary linkages, based on the capacity of the cerebral cortex for forming linkages, a function which finds its concrete expression in the formation of various particular conditioned reflexes.

"The central physiological phenomenon in the normal working of the cerebral hemispheres is that which we termed the *conditioned reflex*. This is a temporary nervous linkage of the innumerable agents of the environment surrounding the animal with particular activities of the organism. We call this phenomenon *association*." (Pavlov, *The Experience of 20 Years*, p. 603.)

According to Pavlov, a conditioned reflex is an example of a particular temporary link. It is characterised by the formation of a linkage between the sensory sphere of the cortical apparatus and the cortical representative of one or another effector.

The concept of "temporary linkage", or "association", is a very wide concept, presupposing the possibility of the formation of nervous links not only between the cortical representatives of receptors and effectors, but also between separate sensory fields of the different cortical areas. "... Association", said I. P. Pavlov, on the Wednesday of November 13, 1935, "is the generic concept, i.e. the bringing together of what was previously separate, the union of two points in a functional relationship, their fusion in one association, whereas a conditioned reflex is a specific concept." (*Pavlov's Wednesdays*, Vol. 3, p. 262.)

In the teaching of Pavlov it is essential to distinguish strictly between the two categories of concept, muddling of which always involves some kind of confusion. There is, first, the concept or principle of temporary linkage, or association, constituting from the theoretical-notional standpoint a methodological category on the basis of which Pavlov analysed and interpreted the physiological mechanisms of the behaviour of animals and man, and, secondly, the concept of conditioned reflexes as a concrete instance of temporary linkage. The use of the cortical dynamics of the conditioned reflex as a means of study is a methodological device which makes possible objective study of the laws governing the flow of nervous changes at the higher levels of the brain. The demonstration given above of the delimitation of the basic concepts in the teaching on higher nervous activity renders obvious the incorrectness of such assertions as those which strive to attribute to Pavlov the desire to reduce the whole complicated behaviour of animals and man to a simple sum of conditioned reflexes.

Having recognised the brain as the material sub-stratum of psychological phenomena, there follows, as a necessary further step, the recognition of the physiological processes taking place in that material sub-stratum as the basis of mental processes. The denial of the significance of the associative principle as the specific expression of the activity of the brain, for the understanding

of psychical phenomena and processes, is a tacit denial of the significance of the materialistic teaching of Pavlov for psychology; it is in essence dualism and animism, an adoption of the concepts of foreign pseudo-science. Criticising the fashionable trend in German idealistic psychology, Pavlov stated bluntly, "Gestalt psychology, with its negation of association, is an absolute minus, in which there is nothing positive." (*Pavlov's Wednesdays*, Vol. 2, p. 580.)

Pavlov's striving to "place the phenomena of our subjective world in a physiological, nervous relationship" has, of course, nothing in common with psycho-physical parallelism and is an attempt to replace the phenomenological contemplation of psychological phenomena by a causal approach to their study.

The correct and scientific nature of such an approach was emphasised in his time by V. I. Lenin in his remarkable work, *What the "Friends of the People" Are And How They Fight Against Social Democracy*. "The metaphysical psychologist would reason about the nature of the soul. The method itself was an absurd one. You cannot argue about the soul without having explained the psychical processes in particular: here progress must consist in abandoning general theories and philosophical disquisitions about the nature of the soul, and in knowing how to put the study of the facts which characterise any particular psychical process on a scientific footing."

To the metaphysical psychologist Lenin counterposes the scientific psychologist who studies the "material sub-stratum of psychical phenomena" and explains mental processes from this strictly scientific point of view. "He, the scientific psychologist," wrote Lenin, "has discarded all philosophical theories about the soul and has set about making a direct study of the material sub-stratum of psychical phenomena—the nervous processes—and has given, let us say, an analysis and explanation of such and such psychological processes." (V. I. Lenin, op. cit., FLPH edition, 1946, p. 22.)

It is clear from these quotations that Lenin not only was not frightened by the "qualitatively peculiar nature of mental processes", but he considered completely legitimate the analysis of these processes on the basis of a study of the functioning of their material sub-stratum.

Thus, the position taken up by Pavlov on the interpretation of the phenomena of mental life appears completely to correspond with the ideas of Lenin on the principles of a genuinely scientific approach to the study of complicated mental phenomena.

Being a believer in the principles of determinism and strictly basing himself on factual material, Pavlov considered it possible to analyse the phenomena of the mental life of man from the point of view of the laws of the activity of the higher parts of the central nervous system, which were established by him with the help of the method of conditioned reflexes. However, the fact that the activity of the brain in animals and in man is governed by the same basic physiological laws did not reduce in importance for Pavlov those specific characteristics which were acquired by man in the course of his historical development.

"In the human phase of the development of the animal world there took place a remarkable addition to the mechanism of nervous activity. In the animal, reality is signalled almost exclusively through stimuli (and their traces in the cerebral hemispheres) which arrive directly in the special cells of the visual, auditory and other receptors of the organism. That is what we experience in ourselves as impressions, sensations, ideas from the environment both of nature in general and the social environment, excluding the spoken and written word. This is the first signalling system of the outside world which is common to us and to animals. But the word constitutes a second signalling system for reality which is peculiar to us; it is a signal of signals." (Pavlov, *The Experience of 20 Years*, p. 722.)

With this new, specifically human, secondary signalling system, in the opinion of Pavlov, there is introduced “a new principle of nervous activity—the abstraction, and at the same time generalisation, of the innumerable signals of the preceding system, together with an analysis and synthesis of these new, generalised signals in their turn—a principle subserving the limitless capacity of man for orientating himself in the surrounding world and creating the higher form of adaptation of man—science—both in the form of general human empiricism and in its specialised form.” (Op. cit., pp. 597, 598.) “However,” notes Pavlov, “there can be no doubt that the basic laws established in regard to the work of the first signalling system must also control the second, since this is also the work of nervous tissue.” (Op. cit., p. 722.)

According to the opinion of Pavlov, the principle of temporary linkages is a basic principle equally of both signalling systems. “The temporary linkage”, as he said, “is a universal physiological phenomenon in the animal world and in ourselves. And at the same time it is also psychological—that which psychologists call association, whether it be the formation of a union between all kinds of activities, impressions or letters, words or thoughts.” (Op. cit., p. 711.)

Thus, the principle of temporary linkages—association—is fundamental, both to crude, elementary adaptation of the animal to surrounding conditions and also to the “limitless orientation” of man in the world around him. Not only the acquired elementary motor reactions, by which animals adapt themselves to external conditions, but also the higher forms of adaptive activity of man, such as thinking, are based, in the final analysis, on the principle of temporary linkages. “Thinking”, said Pavlov at his Wednesdays, “inevitably begins with association, with synthesis, then there goes on a union of the work of synthesis with analysis. Analysis has its basis, on the one hand, in the analytical capacity of our receptors, peripheral endings, and, on the other hand, in the process of inhibition which develops in the cortex and distinguishes that which does not correspond with reality from that which does correspond with reality.” (*Pavlov's Wednesdays*, Vol. 2, pp. 585, 586.)

Of what theoretical-notional significance is the principle of temporary linkages, and how legitimate is the use of it for explaining the mechanisms of adaptive activity at the different stages of the evolution of the animal world up to and including man?

In contrast with the widespread view that the essence of this principle is to be found in the laws governing the reaction of the animal (the conditioned reflex) to successive or simultaneously occurring events, its theoretical-notional significance, its ideological content, must be seen as an assertion of the principle of determinism and a recognition that the objective relationships in the real world around the animal are adequately reflected.

Sequence in the course of events, their relationship in time, is an essential condition for the formation of the conditioned reflex, its biological significance is as an adequate reflection of the links between events taking place outside.

Thus, the principle of temporary linkages is the physiological basis of Lenin's theory of reflection and is the principle of a dialectical-materialist causal analysis of psychical phenomena from the elementary to the highest forms.

Naturally, there is no doubt that conditioned-reflex activity in animals standing on different rungs of the phylogenetical ladder is sharply different, both qualitatively and quantitatively, in accordance with the corresponding morpho-physiological differences between their nervous systems. But the principle of temporary linkages remains equally one of the fundamental

principles of the activity of the higher parts of their nervous system.

The functional perfecting of the brain mass is reflected in "quantitative" changes in the nature of the basic nervous processes; an increase in their lability and the capacity for concentration, a strengthening of the inhibitory processes, a change in the capacity for work and the reactivity of the cortical elements, which subserve new qualitative peculiarities of higher nervous activity. Along with the elementary conditioned reflexes there appear reflexes of a higher order, and there emerges the possibility of the formation, in place of a limited number of temporary linkages, of an unlimited number of them, guaranteeing an ever more perfect adaptation of the animal to the ever-changing conditions of the environment.

Such, in very short and simple outline, is the principle which runs through the teaching of Pavlov on higher nervous activity.

Now let us make a survey of the opinions of our Soviet psychologists on the questions raised above. For this purpose let us use the text-books of psychology for higher educational institutions as being the official material by means of which the opinions of future participants in the building of a truly materialist psychology are being formed.

In fact, a positive attitude to the teaching of Pavlov in the existing basic text-books of psychology for universities (S. L. Rubinstein, *The Foundations of General Psychology*, and *Psychology*, under the editorship of K. N. Kornilov, B. M. Teplov and L. M. Shvarts) appears only in a few flattering general phrases and these usually in the introductory part of the text-book, for example: "Pavlov's research not only ushered in a new epoch in the physiology of higher nervous activity in animals, but also has a great significance for the understanding of many psychical phenomena in man" (Kornilov, p. 26); or "The works of Pavlov, with their positive, physiological content and method, create a serious physiological basis for the development of psychology" (Rubinstein, p. 67).

However, beyond these phrases, which bear a ritual character, there is no progress. In the subsequent exposition, the reader becomes aware that the "tremendous significance" of Pavlov's researches "for the understanding of many psychical phenomena in man" and the creation by him of "a physiological basis for the development of a materialist psychology" is suitable only for the explanation of elementary forms of habitual behaviour, and these chiefly in animals (Rubinstein, p. 86) or in children in earliest youth (Kornilov, p. 317). Then, the chapter on thinking completely persuades the reader as to the absolute theoretical-notional invalidity of the principle of the association theory, otherwise known (according to Pavlov) as the principle of temporary linkages. "The association theory", writes Rubinstein, "attributes the content of thought to the sensory elements of feeling, and the laws governing its course to the law of association. Both of these propositions are untenable." (Rubinstein, p. 286.) "The laws governing the flow of the thought process are not attributable merely to associative links and the laws which define the course of associative processes (the laws of association by spatial and temporal contiguity) . . ." "A linkage based on association between the initial idea and the subsequent one is not the same thing; the process is without direction, there is in it no regulating organisation." (Op. cit., p. 287.)

Farther on there follows a reference to the definition of Selz (a representative of the Würzburg school of German psychology). "Associations, according to the neat characterisation of one of the investigators of the psychology of thought (Selz), create only diffuse reproductions." Further, we read, "the process of association is determined by the formation, through contiguity, of links which are extraneous to its content, and are nearly always unconscious; it therefore does not depend on conscious control and has no purposeful character. The thought process is regulated by objectively existing links which

are more or less adequately reflected in consciousness". (Op. cit., p. 286.)

We read something similar in *Psychology* (edited by K. N. Kornilov) on page 178. Dealing in more detail with the question of intellectual operations, S. L. Rubinstein, in a yet more definite and direct form, alleges the unreliability of Pavlov's teaching for explaining the reflection of essential links and relations between objects. The very kernel of the intellect proper, explains S. L. Rubinstein, is the capacity to distinguish in a situation those properties, with their links and relations, which are essential for action, and to conduct one's activity in accordance with them. These essential links are based on real dependencies, and not on chance coincidences in relatively temporary linkages. (Op. cit., p. 912.)

In the passages quoted from S. L. Rubinstein there are two important questions of principle which are decided by him in a sense contrary to the concepts of Pavlov.

The first question is this: can the principle of association (the principle of temporary linkages, as Pavlov calls it) subserve "the intention" or, to put it more simply, the directedness of the thought process? And the second question is: can essential links and relationships with the objective world be noted and reflected on the basis of the principle of temporary linkages in the form of its particular expression—the conditioned reflex?

It is beyond the least doubt that the association principle of the old schools of psychology (English and German) can certainly in no way be used to explain the phenomena under review, and any attempt to draw upon it for this purpose would constitute a clear expression of mechanistic tendencies in the interpretation of complex psychological phenomena.

However, it also in no way follows from this that the "principle of association" in its Pavlovian sense and in the context of the scientific conception of it is in the same helpless condition as the principle of the old "associationism".

Pavlov is not responsible for the concepts of the old associationists, but he who attempts to explain Pavlov is at least responsible for the correctness of his explanations.

The mistakes committed by the psychologists in the solution of the questions referred to above have their historic basis and constitute without doubt a concession to the idealist positions of foreign psychology.

Developed in the last century by Brentano and Gusserle, the concept of "intention" was used then by the representatives of the Würzburg school to oppose associationism when they tried to show that association created, as it were, only a "diffuse reproduction", adequate to account for "dreamy" states, but by no means for a directed thought process. From that moment, in our Soviet psychology also, there has become firmly implanted a negative attitude to the principle of association, unfortunately not yet dispersed by the works of Pavlov and his school, a fact for which our Soviet psychologists are to a considerable extent responsible.

The psychologists shifted the centre of gravity in the Pavlovian principle of temporary linkages from the reflection of the real relationships in the outside world to the sequence in time of phenomena occurring in the outside world. Thus, they concealed the kernel of the Pavlovian principle, identifying it with the principle of vulgar associationism.

It is not a question of whether temporary nervous linkages are formed as a result of the action of an indifferent stimulus preceding an unconditioned one, but that a temporary linkage arises as a reflection of definite, real relationships in the outside world.

The production of a temporary linkage, of a conditioned reflex, as a result of a chance coincidence of events, Pavlov termed "a simple case",

characterising it by the words “artificial”, “chance”, “unessential”, “unimportant”.

To this “simple case” of formation of a temporary linkage, Pavlov counterposed another case, “when two phenomena are linked together thanks to the fact that they simultaneously act on the nervous system, that two phenomena are linked together which *in reality* are permanently linked [our emphasis, E.V.]. This is already another form of association, which will form the basis for our knowledge, the basis of the scientific principle of causality” (*Pavlov's Wednesdays*, Vol. 3, p. 262.)

The existence of any temporary linkage depends on the external factors which called it into being. If they are changed, then immediately there is a change in the character of the temporary linkage which is produced. Remove the reinforcement of the conditioned reflex with the unconditioned stimulus, and the positive, conditioned reflex is changed into an inhibitory one. Exchange the reinforcement by feeding for a painful one, and, immediately, the stimulus which formerly produced a feeding-type reaction now calls forth a defensive response. Not only that, but, as E. A. Asratyan first showed—and in this is contained one of his greatest contributions—in the conditions of a definite influence it is possible to achieve the complete switching of the reaction to the effect of the same conditioned signals.

Thus, in the Pavlovian principle of temporary linkages is, as was said above, the physiological basis for Lenin's theory of reflection.

A lack of understanding of this circumstance and the identification of Pavlov's principle of temporary linkages with the principle of vulgar associationism leads our psychologists to the assertion that “essential links and relationships” cannot be reflected on the basis of the mechanism of the conditioned reflex, of the temporary linkage or association.

Such an assertion can be made either by a pure idealist who conceives the possibility of penetrating into the nature of objective relationships in a “transcendental manner” or by a person who ignores the teaching of Pavlov on internal inhibition. Indeed, what are essential links and relationships between phenomena, and in what way are they to be distinguished from chance coincidences of given phenomena in time? In the first place by their obedience to a general law, as shown by their constancy. But the constancy of relationships is also a necessary condition for the existence of a given temporary linkage, of a given conditioned reflex. If a conditioned reflex is developed to relationships between phenomena which are accidental and therefore do not obey any general law, then in the sequel, as a result of lack of reinforcement, it falls into the category of inhibited items, being differentiated from the conditioned reflex which is constantly reinforced as a result of its conformity to a general law of links between phenomena. In consequence of this process of differentiation, the remaining positive, conditioned reflex proves to be adequate for regular links between external events and it reflects through itself the real and essential links between objects.

A correct understanding of the principles of the Pavlovian teaching permits of a similar factual and basic solution of the question of the directedness of the thought process, without any resort to foreign authorities. Investigations carried out by us by the method of conditioned reflexes in the field of the phenomena of adaptation to situations show that at the basis of the directedness of the process of association is elective reproduction (a process which is the opposite of the “diffuse reproduction” of Selz), which appears as the physiological basis of intention in the process of thinking.

According to the views of the psychologists set out above, it follows, quite obviously, that the teaching on higher nervous activity, with all its principles and the laws established by it, can in no way be used for an analysis of the physiological bases of the psychological activity of man, and must be

limited in its application to an explanation of the mechanisms of most exceptional cases of "a limited passive habit". (S. L. Rubinstein, *Foundations of General Psychology*, p. 86.)

This is the "pitiless sentence" which psychology has pronounced on the teaching of Academician I. P. Pavlov and on the "ideological basis" on which future Soviet psychologists are being educated in our colleges!

But, if Pavlov's teachings are not suitable for understanding the physiological basis of normal mental activity in men, then, by the same token, they are not suitable for the analysis of those pathological disturbances of activity which were so fruitfully studied in his last years by Pavlov himself and by his pupils.

The obvious bankruptcy of such a point of view, based on elements of deep-rooted conservatism, demands the prosecution of a vigorous struggle for the purification of the ideological position of contemporary psychology.

Simultaneously with this there will be created also the necessary prerequisites for the reconstruction of the principles of Soviet psychopathology.

Psychiatrists, relying, after the example set by the psychologists, for the greater part of their education on psychological principles established by tradition, take the teaching of Pavlov for a purely physiological conception, having no organic link with the problems of psychology, and thus, if they do make use of it, it is most often, in a purely formal manner, designed for declarative purposes. From this it is clearly essential to proceed to the radical reconstruction of psychology and psychopathology on the basis of Pavlov's teaching, and also to the preparation of the cadres of young specialists needed for this purpose.

The most immediate task is the creation of a new text-book of psychology for the higher educational institutions, freed from the traditional incorrect views on the teaching of Pavlov on conditioned reflexes and its significance.

The new text-book of psychology must educate future psychologists in the spirit of the materialist teaching of Sechenov and Pavlov, guaranteeing the preparation of new cadres capable of accomplishing a mighty task, the construction of a materialist psychology based on the principles of the theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin.

—Translated from *NEVROPATOLOGIYA I PSIKHIATRIYA*, Vol. 20, No. 1 (January 1951), by Brian H. Kirman.

FOUNDATIONS OF SOVIET AND WESTERN PSYCHIATRY

A Discussion of some recent Literature

By John McLeish

PSYCHIATRY, perhaps more than any other discipline, directly reflects the influence of the social environment in a magnified form. The patient, in his incomplete adjustment to reality which, in one form or another, underlies all mental illness, acts as a mirror in which some particular aspect of the environment is reflected in distorted fashion. The psychiatric practitioner must come to some kind of terms with that objective reality which is in question. His therapeutic measures and his theories of aetiology must rest on some basis of opinion—which in our particular culture is often un verbalised—about the nature of man and of society. Consequently, the study of psychiatry, whether

Soviet or non-Soviet, forms part of the raw material of sociology, and to the social scientist must be a particularly rewarding study, throwing a concentrated beam on the problems of his specialism.

In the case of Soviet psychiatry and psychology the fundamental, formative influences are very clear to the view, it being one of the most important tasks of Soviet psychology to clarify and state, entirely on the verbal level, the basic assumptions on which it rests. In the case of Western psychology and psychiatry the basic organising concepts are more difficult to find, and there is much less unanimity as to what these are among practitioners of the psychiatric art. This lack of unanimity, and the degree of unconcern shown about it, is regarded by Soviet psychologists as symptomatic of what they call "the crisis of contemporary bourgeois psychology", referred to in most recent articles and textbooks of psychology.*

The striking contrast between the attitudes to basic theory which confronts us immediately we attempt to compare in logical order the two psychiatries, is perhaps the main distinguishing characteristic as between Soviet and Western psychiatry, and runs like a red thread through the whole practice and theory of psychiatrists in these two worlds. There is an irreconcilable conflict, beginning at the very roots of the two subjects; to ask for, or to hope for, a reconciliation in the spirit of Dr. Julian Huxley's appeal for one world in genetics would be as ill adapted to the realities of the situation as asking the CPSU immediately to form a coalition government with Kerensky. There was a time—some time between 1920 and 1930 perhaps—when Soviet and Western psychiatry started from very much the same starting point; but the important thing to notice is not the common starting point but rather the fact that they have been travelling in opposite directions ever since. What is of immediate contemporary interest and relevance is not the question of a reconciliation but an elucidation of the sources of conflict with a view to working out a *modus vivendi*. "Principles", says Yuri Zhdanov, "are not subject to compromise, but gain victory."

The point of departure of Western psychiatry is indicated in a quotation from a prominent American medical psychologist, Dr. Granville Jones.⁹ "Probably most psychiatrists believe that in the ultimate analysis mental disease is psychogenic, and therefore is properly treated by psychological methods, properly integrated with appropriate medical and surgical measures. However, in view of the incompleteness of our present knowledge, and the consequent crudity of our treatment, most of us are not willing to reject any empirically useful methods. . . . The same problems, one must observe in all fairness, exist in the practice of somatic medicine. Surgery is largely a primitive approach to disease, and in the Utopian future will be limited to a few such conditions as skeletal injuries." It is clear that in the Utopian future visualised by Dr. Jones not only surgery but all psychiatric techniques other than those based on interpersonal relations between physician and patient (and perhaps the patient's immediate circle) will have been superseded. It is clear from the text also that the psychogenic ætiology of psychiatric disorder and the psychological methods of therapy to be utilised are conceived as being, in the main, Freudian in derivation.

In fact, in this short quotation we are brought into immediate contact with the prevailing climate of opinion in Western psychiatry, and on analysis this passage can be made to yield up the foundation principles of this subject. A theoretical framework of Freudian concepts is supplemented by borrowings on an eclectic† basis from dissentients from this school (for example, Jung, Horney, Melanie Klein, etc.) with an addition of certain physical therapeutic

* cf. list of references at the end of this article, and the bibliography on "the crisis of bourgeois psychology" in *Sovietskaya Pedagogika*, 1950. 12. 107. † See p. 19.

techniques developed on an empirical, pragmatic† basis from what were, in the main, accidental observations—this is a summary characterisation of the structure of contemporary psychiatry in the West. Eclecticism in theory, empiricism in practice—with an abiding faith that all theoretical obscurities will be clarified by the future developments in psychiatric research—this description contains at once the positive and negative aspects of Western psychiatry.

On the other hand, Davidenkov,⁵ for example, thinks of a neurosis as a functional disorder of the nervous system for which the physiological basis has not yet been established. According to Soviet psychiatrists, “psychologism” is excusable only when we know nothing about the *substrat* of nervous physiological processes. The work of Pavlov and his school is now taken as supplying the necessary conceptual foundation for the understanding of most neurotic conditions. In other words, the Russians maintain that future advances in psychiatry must lead to the progressive abandonment of psychogenic concepts of mental disfunctioning and of analytic psychotherapy (in the sense in which these are understood here); these will be replaced by considerations based on reflex activity and social influences (in the sense in which these are understood in the Soviet Union). The single point of agreement between the two psychiatric antagonists seems to be that in the ideal future psychiatry, as we know it, will disappear. The Russian psychiatrists hope that it will be swallowed up by physiology and otherwise rendered unnecessary by the achievement of the communist society; the Western psychiatrist hopes to become redundant by the future developments in psychology and the progressive education of individuals in interpersonal relationships on the basis of these discoveries.

According to the Soviet formulation, it is clear that Freud and all the schools derived from him must be totally rejected, since these represent those forces in psychiatric development which are dying away or disintegrating. “Pavlov”, says his disciple Frolov,⁷ “destroyed Freud’s house of cards”. The struggle against Freudianism, enjoined on all Soviet psychologists and psychiatrists, is seen as part of the contemporary class struggle, and is associated with the struggle against what is called American imperialism and reaction—“The American bourgeoisie is simply intoxicated with the reactionary teachings of Freud”, and so on. The sources of Soviet psychiatry are taken to be those ideas which are regarded as the progressive contributions of pre-revolutionary Russian medicine and physiology. Merzheyevsky, Korsakov and other psychiatrists, with their emphasis on the humanistic aspects of medicine and the influence of social and economic factors in the development of mental disorder,¹⁰ together with the views of Pavlov, regarded as the canalisation of all that was best in pre-revolution Russian physiology, are emphasised as important elements in the formation of Soviet psychiatry. In the light of the recent discussion on the development of Pavlov’s views, one may say that the integration of the two concepts of “nervism” (Pavlov-Botkin)⁸ and of “reflection” (Engels-Lenin)¹⁵ are to be regarded as the two basic principles on which future psychiatric research should be founded.¹

The consistent development of Lenin’s principle of reflection, as in Chernakov’s critique of Rubinstein, acts as a halfway house between theory and therapy. It exemplifies the *social* approach to the problems of neurosis, as distinct from the *individual* approach of Western psychiatry. Chernakov says:⁴ “Inner conflicts are possible, but we must see in them not a collision of feeling and reason taken by themselves, not a collision of something from within against something from without, but as a reflection of the real conflicts of

† These terms are used in a descriptive, and not in an evaluative, connotation. In a Western context these adjectives are not necessarily derogatory, as, of course, they are in a contemporary Soviet context. cf. 14.

objective reality. In the contradictory nature of our thoughts, ideas, as well as our feelings, materialist psychologists must see the objectively existing contradictions of nature and social life, which are reflected in our thoughts, ideas and feelings." Support for this view is found in Lenin's article on "Leo Tolstoy as a Mirror of the Russian Revolution",¹² in which Lenin explains the contradictions of Tolstoy's thinking on social problems from the actually contradictory status of the peasantry in the (1905) revolution and of the great writer as a mouthpiece of their point of view. The conflict thus did not originate in the Russian "soul", as manifested in the person of Count Tolstoy, but in the sphere of social and economic relationships. Speaking of a more recent revolution, the psychiatrist Gilyarovsky says:⁸ "The liquidation of capitalism with its exploitation of man by man provides the radical solution of the problem of the traumatising of man by man. . . . We have not yet succeeded in eliminating the remnants of capitalism in the psychology of men . . ." The Freudian conflict between the animal and the social, between the conscious and the unconscious, the rational and the passional, conceals the real source of conflict which, according to the Russians, lies in the class struggle. A neurotic person on this view is one who cannot resolve the conflict in his own mind, which thus continues to reflect *both* aspects, the contradictory elements in social relationships. An interesting question of legal responsibility arises in this connection, since a strict interpretation of this principle (in isolation from other tenets of Soviet psychology) might lead one to suggest that Bukharin, for example, or Fuchs, in their separate confessions, gave classic examples of just such confusions in their introspective analyses of the psychology of treason. The answer probably lies in the sphere of volition; that is to say, a person who has devotion to principle has the duty to throw himself into the struggle on the side of the progressive forces in society, and in doing so will effect a radical change in the mental balance of forces. In so far as the criminal voluntarily fails to take this step, he must bear the responsibility for his criminal acts.

Great emphasis is therefore laid on *education* in the prevention and treatment of psychiatric conditions. There is an emphasis throughout on the rational aspects of behaviour; the keynotes of psychotherapy being rational insight combined with suggestion and support by external social agencies.¹⁸ Individual psychotherapy is, apparently, not used to any great extent, partly because of the antagonism to analytic methods and theories, and partly because it cannot be made available to the large numbers requiring treatment. Group therapy is practised, the psychiatrist and patient working all the time within the social framework of socialised medicine, which operates through local and regional clinics, trade union welfare organisations, and so on. The therapeutic regimen can be summed up as: an appeal throughout to the rational understanding, the relief of physiological conditions, the reinforcement by hypnosis and suggestion of all positive influences, removal of the patient from harmful conditions of an environmental character, correct education especially in the development of a proper attitude to work by means of work therapy of an appropriate character. Except where there are contraindications, the latter is regarded as of immense importance, because it is through co-operative work that man attains his highest level of development. The active treatment of psychosis—including insulin shock, electroshock, sulphur therapy, colloidoclastic shock, pre-frontal leucotomy, and so on—has been practised for many years in the Soviet Union. The results appear to be very similar to those found elsewhere,⁶ the major difference perhaps resting in the attempt by Soviet psychiatrists to relate the particular technique used to a general theory of the organism. For this latter reason it would appear from the Pavlov discussion and other evidence that methods

which destroy the integrity of the organism—such as pre-frontal leucotomy—are now regarded with some suspicion. Similar doubts, of course, have been expressed here, but from an empirical rather than from a theoretical point of view.

Medical psychology in the Soviet Union, like every other branch of human endeavour, reflects the conditions of life in that country. Since its primary concern is the *human* material, especially that fragment of the population which cannot, for one reason or another, face up to the stresses and strains of living in society, and perhaps of this new society in particular, a study of the views and practices of those who must deal with this human material has much to offer.

REFERENCES

1. ANANIEV, B. G. *Osnovnie Zadachi Sovetskoi Psikhologii*. Moscow, 1950.
2. ANON. *Russian Psychiatry*. (*Lancet*, 1951, 6648, p. 220.)
3. BABKIN, B. P. *Pavlov: A Biography*. London, 1951.
4. CHERNAKOV, E. T. *Protiv Idealizma i Metafiziki v Psikhologii*. (*Voprosy Filosofii*, 1948, 3, 301-315.)
5. DAVIDENKOV, S. *Nevroz*. (*Bolshaya Entsiklopediya*, 1939, 41, 444.)
6. FLEMING, G. W. *Recent Progress in Psychiatry*, Vol. 2 (*Journal of Mental Science*, London, 1950.)
7. FROLOV, I. *Zhizneutverzhdaiushchee Uchenie*. (*Literaturnaya Gazeta*, 1949.)
8. GILYAROVSKI, V. A. *Psikhiatriya*. (*Medgiz*, Moscow, 1942.)
9. JONES, G. L. *Psychiatric Shock Therapy*. New York, 1950.
10. KANNABIKH, I. V. *Istoriya Psikhiatrii*. Moscow, 1929. (Quoted by Wortis.)
11. KORNILOV, K. N., SMIRNOV, A. A., and TEPOV, B. M. *Psikhologiya*. (*Uchpedgiz*, Moscow, 1948.)
12. LENIN, V. I. *Five Essays on Tolstoy. Dialectics* (Critics' Group, New York), 1938, 6.
13. LEONTIEV, A. N. *Vazhneishie Zadachi Sovetskoi Psikhologii itd.* (*Sovietskaya Pedagogika*, 1949, 1, 76-85.)
14. MCLEISH, J. *Aspects of Soviet and American Psychology* (*Soviet Studies*, 1950, 1, 343-346.)
15. MCLEISH, J. *Psychology in the Soviet Union*. (*Quarterly Bulletin, British Psychological Society*, 1951, 12, 47-52.)
16. TEPOV, B. M. *Psikhologiya*. (*Uchpedgiz*, Moscow, 1950.)
17. *Pravda*. June 29—July 9, 1950.
18. WORTIS, J. *Soviet Psychiatry*. Baltimore, 1950.

☆ ☆ ☆

For details of other translated and survey material available on Soviet Psychology and Psychiatry, see inside back cover.

☆ ☆ ☆

BOYANUS SCHOOL OF RUSSIAN

42 Doughty Street, London, W.C.1

Telephone : HOLborn 6770

Classes for beginners and students of all grades.

- ~ Each class usually consists of about six students
- ~ All classes are in the evening.
- ~ Fee for one term (twelve weeks, twenty-four lessons), £3/10/0.
- ~ Private lessons can be arranged : particulars from the Secretary.

SUMMER TERM begins April 28

TRADE UNION ACTIVITY IN SOVIET FACTORIES : 2

This second collection in our series of representative translations from the Soviet trade union press illustrates the everyday activity of trade unions in the sphere of culture. The journal from which the three articles that follow have been taken, The Club, is published monthly by the Central Council of Trade Unions. Its circulation is 50,000.

1

HOW WE WORK WITH OUR READERS

By T. Yemelianova

Librarian at the Club of the ELECTROSTAL Works, Moscow Region

ONE day when exchanging books the librarian of one of our mobile units, Lyuba Orlova, said to me : “ Please let me have Belinsky’s *Selected Works*. Dolgov wants them very much.” Orlova had told us more than once about assistant machine operator Vladimir Dolgov. We knew that he was fond of books, and particularly interested in the history of Russian literature. I gave her the one-volume edition and asked her to invite him to the library. That was about a year ago. The young workman called at the library and became not only an active and constant reader but also a member of the literary discussion circle and a participant in readers’ conferences. On the advice of the library staff he enrolled in the evening school for young workers,¹ and this spring passed into the eighth class with distinction.

Nikolai Kozeyev, an assistant steel smelter in the second foundry shop, is one of our oldest readers. He often comes to us for advice about what book to buy and where it can be got. His interests are very varied. He reads books on international politics, writes notes on the technical literature of his own profession and is also fond of *belles-lettres*.

Friendship between the library and steel-smelter Georgii Vlasov began with his speech at a readers’ conference on a book by V. Kurochkin *The Quick-Witted Brigade*. After the conference we drew up at his request a list of books we recommended on his own speciality, as a result of which—in his own words—he began to understand the theory of steel production better.

Our readers are people of various trades and ages, but all have a thirst for knowledge.

“ Advise me what I ought to read about China. I’ve got to give a talk to my work team . . . ”

“ I like the poetry of Vladimir Mayakovsky. What articles are there on his work that I could read ? ”

“ Would you please help me to get together some literature on steel smelting ? I want to study to be an assistant foreman.”

I could give hundreds more examples of the questions with which our readers daily come to the library. Books are a reliable help to most of our

¹ These give young workers who began earning their living after finishing primary school, but wish to resume their education, a full secondary education in after-work classes. [See *Education in a Textile Factory*, ANGLO-SOVIET JOURNAL XII, 1 (Spring 1951).]

workers. During six months of 1951 we had 27,618 callers. More than 4,000 workers at Electrostal are our constant readers.

How do we work with them, what are our facilities and how do we use them?

Our library has 64,000 volumes, of which 25,000 are in the children's section. During the first half of 1951 we had 85,632 issues.

We have many varieties of propaganda for books. In the first place I will mention our exhibitions. At present in the library and reading room we have the following exhibitions and stands: *The Life and Work of V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin*; *The Results of the Five Year Plan*; *The Struggle for Peace—Common Cause of All Nations*; *The Great Building Jobs of Communism*; and *M. Y. Lermontov*.

The exhibitions are systematically brought up to date and replaced by others; and in addition we have special display cases of popular scientific works, new technical books and novels, and study guides. Recently we have begun to make use of the reading plans issued by the All-Union Lenin Library. They are of great assistance in helping the reader. The librarian inserts copies of the plans in the readers' tickets, and collects appropriate literature for them on request.

For our mobile units and the Red Corners² in the factory departments and hostels we have built up small mobile exhibitions and stands. We use them there when there are talks, readings and lectures. But such aids cannot give the reader all the answers he requires.

We have a reading-room in the library. As the number of young people studying has increased, and with the growth of interest in technical and scientific literature, we have reorganised the work of the reading-room. A great deal of reference and bibliographical work goes on there. We have collected into special folders and albums reviews and critical articles on many branches of politics, science, technique and *belles-lettres*. The number of such folders has now reached one hundred. The reader moreover has at his disposal all kinds of reference books, text-books, newspaper and magazine material. Text-books for our students have been placed at the disposal of the reading-room in large numbers.

Readers' conferences play an important part in book propaganda among our workers. Notices put up in the Red Corners, the club and the reading-room tell them of the day and subject of the reports to be made at these conferences. An exhibition of books intended for discussion is put up in the library, and our readers have distributed to them a list of literature recommended as preparation for the conference. Members of our library Council and our activists arrange talks, invite our readers to take part in the conference and distribute cards of invitation.

Recently we have had conferences on *Soviet Literature in the Struggle for Peace and Democracy*, and *The Stalin Constitution and Soviet Youth*. The latter was particularly interesting. Four hundred and fifty workers attended.

This year also we held for the first time two conferences for the discussion of technical works. One of them was devoted to S. Gnuchev's *The Assistant Steel-Smelter at Electric Furnaces*, and was held in the steel-smelting shop. It was a successful experiment. As a result of the discussion the workmen made a number of valuable practical proposals, some of which have already been put into effect. Recently the activists of this same department, jointly with the library, organised a readers' conference on F. Yedneral's book *Electro-metallurgy*, which was held in the Red Corner. We intend to organise

² Recreation and reading rooms (partitioned off in each department in a large factory, or in a separate room in a smaller plant).

discussion of specialist technical works in other departments as well. The readers' conferences have noticeably increased the demand for technical literature: twenty per cent of our readers today are taking out books on various subjects connected with metallurgy.

Our twenty-four mobile units play an important part in organising these conferences. These units are distributed among the Red Corners of the hostels and departments, and are at present serving 1,500 readers. Our best voluntary workers—A. Demyanova (railway department), M. Belyaeva (youth hostel), and others—are indefatigable in their activity. They draw up reading plans, help in getting together literature on particular subjects, recommend critical articles, arrange for literary readings and issue wall-newspapers. In response to demand we have also organised mobile units of technical literature for some of the shops.

In addition to readers' conferences, the library—jointly with the committee of the Communist League of Youth—arranges literary evenings. These involve not only our activists but also members of the drama, dance and vocalists' circles. Usually these evenings are devoted to the work of the greatest writers and poets—Gorki, Mayakovsky, Lermontov, Saltykov-Shchedrin, Ostrovsky and others. For such evenings we arrange exhibitions and lists of recommended literature.

For all our work with the readers we five full-time library workers rely upon the everyday assistance of 200 voluntary activists among our readers. They give talks, arrange the exhibitions, issue wall-newspapers and bind the books.

The chairman of our library Council, engineer A. Dolzhansky, comes into the library almost every day, selects technical books for the mobile units, and prepares subjects for the next conference. On Monday and Friday evenings he is there to give advice to readers on technical questions. Chief foreman Solodikhin is in charge of the *Readers' Bulletin*, in which we print comments by our readers on technical books. Another member of the library Council, Zubova, helps to organise readers' conferences, and engineer Zaks is in charge of bibliographical work.

In the Red Corners our activists are assisted by volunteers who read aloud pieces of literature under discussion. Thus Tamara Molotova, a worker in the iron foundry, read to her fellow workers during dinner hours and after shifts A. Perventsev's *The Honour of Youth*, V. Nekrasov's *In the Trenches of Stalingrad* and other books.

Our library has now existed for nearly a quarter of a century. During this period traditions have grown up, and a definite style of work. But we still have much to do. In the autumn we want to introduce reviews of literature, more discussions of technical books in the departments and more exhibitions.

—Slightly abridged from *KLUB*, 2, 1951 (August)

2

MASS CULTURAL WORK AT A GREAT BUILDING JOB

By F. Voshchenko

Chairman of the Trade Union Job Committee, Stalingrad Power Construction Scheme

ON the banks of the legendary Volga great events are taking place. Soviet people are putting up one of the giant constructions of the Stalin era, the Stalingrad Hydro-Electric Station. And once again, as in years gone by, the eyes of millions of people are turned to Stalingrad. Every day we get hundreds of letters from all parts of the Soviet Union expressing the desire to take part

in the building of the scheme and telling us of production successes in fulfilling ahead of time the special orders placed for the requirements of the great schemes. In recent months alone we have had over 11,000 letters.

The scale of work at our job is expressed in almost astronomical figures. We have to remove more than 6,000,000 cubic metres of earth and lay down more than 7,000,000 cubic metres of concrete and ferro-concrete. The work is being done by first-class Soviet machinery—powerful dredgers, excavators and bulldozers, mighty tractors and self-tipping lorries.

Our builders make skilful use of this powerful technical equipment, and socialist emulation for its most effective application has developed on a wide scale. Every day the country learns the names of new leaders and innovators in this socialist emulation. Educational and mass cultural work plays no small part in promoting this development of creative initiative among the builders ; and the people engaged in this great Stalin job deserve particular care and attention.

The builder of today is a workman handling advanced technique, a worker who has mastered the most complex mechanisms. Hundreds of lectures for the workers and technical staff have already been given by leading people on the construction schemes. One of our most active lecturers is the head of the construction scheme, Stalin Prize-winner F. G. Loginov. He has given several substantial lectures on the theme : *The Stalingrad State Power Station—greatest construction scheme of the Stalin epoch.*

To propagate technical knowledge we have set up a special lecturers' group, which includes engineers Kolesnikov, Artemenko, Dolinsky and Lazutin. Chief engineer Medvedyev, who is chairman of this group, recently gave a lecture for the building workers on the theme : *New Soviet technique at the Stalingrad building site.* Other lectures have been given on the following subjects : *Prospects of agricultural development as the result of power station construction ; The Volga-Don Canal ; The giant power schemes and their influence on the further development of industry, agriculture and transport ; Changes in the economic geography of the Volga-Caspian Region as a result of the building of the Kuibyshev and Stalingrad power stations ; and The great building jobs of Communism and their significance for the national economy.*

N. N. Lapin, secretary of the Party organisation, makes systematic reports on the international situation and the struggle of the heroic Korean people. An interesting and instructive talk for the young builders was given by comrade Ageyenkova, who was a delegate at the second congress of the World Federation of Democratic Youth.

But in spite of the large scale on which our lecture work has been organised, we daily get requests for more lectures and reports from the site committees scattered over our great job.

A great work of agitation and education is being done by our voluntary helpers. They organise meetings with the best workers to study their advanced experience, issue wall-newspapers and hand-written "flashes", and in many places have put up special noticeboards for indicator figures of the course of socialist emulation.

From all parts of the Soviet Union, from organisations, students and school children, our Trade Union Job Committee receives scientific and political books, poetry and novels. Students of the Saratov State University, on the initiative of their trade union organisation, sent us 1,100 books. We have had literature also from the Ukraine and the Urals, from Belorussia and the Stavropol region, from school children at Chita, Armavir and Kharkov. Our five libraries (including one of technical literature) comprise more than 11,000 books between them.

Lately the Job Committee bought several thousand volumes of political literature and *belles-lettres* and organised a number of small mobile libraries. Their readers are growing in numbers daily.

The Job Committee is assisted in its task of organising recreation for the building workers by the theatres and cultural and educational institutions of our country.

On the left bank of the Volga, circus performers give us interesting regular programmes. We also had recently with us the State Folk-Dance Ensemble, under the direction of Stalin Prize-winner Igor Moiseyev, People's Artist of the Republic. Over 1,400 building workers came to the concert. Members of the Moscow Regional Philharmonic Orchestra gave a performance at our new summer theatre. The collective of the Gorki Theatre of Drama at Stalingrad has "adopted" our job. In their letter to the workers, the actors wrote: "We cannot stand aside when all the peoples of the Soviet Union are playing their part in the great construction jobs of Communism." That was the beginning of close friendship between these art workers and the building workers.

The amateur art collectives of the Stalingrad factories have also become frequent visitors at the construction site. In June the Tractor Works Collective gave four big concerts. A dramatic spectacle, *The Great Construction Jobs of Communism*, was well presented.

On the initiative of the Trade Union Job Committee, mass expeditions to theatres, cinemas and museums have been organised. The building workers have visited the area of operations of the 62nd Army, the Museum of the Defence of Tsaritsyn-Stalingrad, and the Stalingrad Regional Theatre of Drama. At the head office of the construction scheme a drama circle is at work, headed by V. Kosovskaya, secretary of the finance department. It has already given the workers a performance of I. Lukovsky's play *On the Watch over Security* and is preparing a performance of A. N. Ostrovsky's play *Carnival has its End*.

Our concert circle, which is directed by senior geological engineer Kostin, has in its repertoire one-act plays on contemporary subjects, Russian folk-songs and dances. Members of this circle have given four concerts at construction sites, and have twice visited neighbouring collective farms.

The Job Committee, however, still pays insufficient attention to the work of the Red Corners. We have a club, but we make poor use of it. Mass political work is still not properly developed there, and there are still too few amateur art circles. We have not yet found organisers for them.

I must say a word of reproach to the trade union and Communist League of Youth organisations of the Bolshoi Theatre in Moscow. The young actors "adopted" amateur art activities at the Stalingrad power construction scheme. They wrote about it to *Komsomolskaya Pravda*—and that was the end of their "adoption".

Sports activities have not been properly developed either, and we have no fully equipped physical culture fields. We have made several applications to the All-Union Committee for Physical Culture and Sports to send us assistance in the shape of sports instructors: but to our surprise these requests have not been favoured with any reply.

We still organise readers' conferences too rarely. We ought to have systematic discussions of new books and films in the hostels and at the club.

The builders of the Stalingrad Hydro-Electric Station are conducting a battle to finish this great work of peace ahead of time. All the political, educational and mass cultural work of our trade union organisations should promote the fulfilment of this responsible task.

—Slightly abridged from *KLUB*, 3, 1951 (September)

GIVE US MORE GOOD AND VARIED PLAYS

*An Open Letter to Playwrights from thirty-seven workers of the
TREKHGORNAYA Textile Combine*

Dear Comrades,

The Central Committee of our Party has called on all writers capable of writing plays to reflect the life of Soviet society truthfully in its constant advance, to depict the best sides of the character of Soviet people and to become genuine propagandists of the vital foundation of the Soviet order of things—its policy.

Our dramatists have responded warmly to the call of the Bolshevik Party. They have proved capable in recent years of creating not a few important highly artistic and inspired productions. It is with great interest, Alexander Yevdokimovich Korneichuk, that we have seen in the theatres and heard on the radio your plays *Makar Dubrava* and *The Hawthorn Grove*. They moved us by their profound fidelity to life.

We thank you too, Nikolai Fyodorovich Pogodin, for your joyful film scenario about the Kuban Cossacks, so full of real optimism and healthy laughter. The heroes of this picture are near and dear to us. But may we ask you, Nikolai Fyodorovich, why more recently you have not produced a single new play about the workers and collective farmers who have been building the post-war Stalin five-year plan?

Our older comrades tell us how in the thirties they used to go again and again to see your plays *Tempo*, *The Poem of the Axe* and *My Friend*, and how these works helped them truly to understand the new that was appearing in the vast creative effort of life, and to work still better for a happy future. To this day they carry in their memory the names and figures of the heroes of your plays—the steel smelter Stepan, the working woman Anka, the manager Grigorii Gai.

You brought these people on to the stage from the works and building jobs of the Urals, Gorki and Moscow during the first Stalin five-year plans; but today, in our factories and building jobs, have we so few famous heroes of our own time?

Come and visit us at the Trekhgornaya Textile Mills, Nikolai Fyodorovich, and you will see Soviet man in all his heroic stature, in all the richness of his spiritual and moral qualities. We invite you too, Boris Andreyevich Lavrenyev, and you, Boris Sergeyeovich Romashov, and you, Leonid Maximovich Leonov, and you, Nikolai Yevgenyevich Virta, and you, Konstantin Mikhailovich Simonov.

You are known, you are loved—and much is expected of you. For us Soviet people literature has become a part of our own flesh and blood, and we cherish a most profound respect for your complex creative work. We value that work highly. We rejoice with you at your every successful production, comparing it to some big victory on the economic front. And on the other hand, any serious failure on your part distresses us.

We await new plays about our spacious and colourful life, about our selfless struggle for communism. We await modern comedies full of the joy of life, which will allow us to relax and to laugh heartily—comedies which show up laziness, stupidity and swelled-headedness.

We are not theatrical critics, nor yet specialists on questions of art and drama. We are workmen of the largest textile combine in the capital, the rank-

and-file readers and audience of your plays ; and we want, comrades, to have a thoroughly frank talk with you in this letter and to hand you our account.

Why are there so few good new plays now about Soviet people, and why does reading a new play, or seeing it at the theatre, so often leave behind a feeling of irritation and disappointment ? It seems to us that one of the serious reasons for this is that the authors are poorly acquainted with the life they are depicting.

The action of a number of plays takes place at factories and works, in collective farms or scientific research institutions. It is a very good thing that our dramatists want to display Soviet man in his main activity—at work. But in order to describe this attractively and ardently, it is essential to study and get to know the people engaged in production. In order to depict in a play such men and women as Alexander Chutkikh, Pavel Bykov, Nikolai Rossiisky, Lydia Korabelnikova, it is not enough to read books about them or to hear their speeches. One must penetrate deeply into their thoughts, live their life with them. Otherwise the play will prove to be of little interest, its heroes dim and lifeless figures.

The epoch of the great communist construction works ought to bring into existence new and vivid works showing the true heroes of our time, those who subdue rivers and make deserts flower. Their life, their work are filled with a tense, magnificent struggle for all that is new. And is there so little of genuine dramatic quality and of sharpest conflict in that struggle ?

We shall not dwell here on such mistaken plays as *Honesty*, by K. Finn, or *The Lutonin Family*, by the Tur Brothers and I. Pyriev, which many of our comrades have seen in the theatres. We want to say something about a play that is particularly close to us, A. Surov's *Dawn over Moscow*, which is devoted to the textile workers. The playwright read it to us at our factory, and many of his hearers asked him even then how it was possible for such a politically backward and narrow-minded person as Solntseva to find herself in the post of director of a textile factory in the capital. Also the figure of the artist, who gets a post at the factory by pulling wires and then makes designs utterly devoid of talent, seemed to us artificial. Could a healthy collective at a factory tolerate such a worker ? Unquestionably no. The figure of Sanya Solntseva is also remote from life. Surov thanked our collective for its just and well-meant criticism. When he was closing the discussion, he promised to visit us again and work over his play once more with our amateur art group. But we never saw him again. Yet such discussions of new plays among workers and engineers, especially on production themes, may be of great help to our playwrights.

Up to now we have spoken as spectators ; but many of us are not only spectators but also performers of your plays, as members of amateur art groups.

Believe us, dear comrades, the hero of real life is loftier, more interesting and more attractive than the blueprint devoid of flesh and blood which passes as a positive figure in the majority of one-act plays.

It is painful to admit it, but we cannot now name a single one-act play that we should like to put on. They have different authors and different titles, but all of them are as like one another as peas in a pod.

Through the journal *KLUB* we appeal to you, masters of the drama and young authors alike : write truthful, inspired and artistic plays about our glorious working class, about the builders of communism who are the main heroes of the present day. These plays are awaited by the vast army of amateur art workers and by millions of spectators.

Slightly abridged from KLUB, 4, 1951 (October)

A DIFFICULT POSITION

By M. Edel

It was clear that the business was not making headway. Kupin was deputy director of a State stock-breeding farm. He had asked Ampleyev, deputy director of the *Great Goroditsky Porcelain Works*, to have three tea services made for him in cobalt, with monograms.

"You see, Nikolai Parfenovich," said he, "what can one do to impress one's best visitors these days? Cream? Lamb? An astrakhan for a keepsake? As things stand now they mean nothing. And here's your factory just handy. You can turn to us, whether it's spring sowing or harvest time. We'll help! What objection can you have? I'm only asking for three services—with gold rims, of course, and the monograms—that's essential. . . ."

Almost imperceptibly Nikolai Parfenovich shook his head and gazed at his visitor like a doctor at a patient who is not aware yet that he has a serious complaint.

"You know how long our factory's been in existence?" he asked. "Little short of a hundred years. And do you know that basically there are three dynasties working here—the Trubkins, the Ampleyevs and the Kirdyagins? And that these three working-class dynasties built our factory, later reconstructed it and that, by and large, there's more tradition behind us than there is behind the Moscow Maly Theatre?"

"And these three dynasties—what have they to do with my three tea services?"

"What's my surname, then? Ampleyev! And my wife's maiden name? Trubkin! See? See what a position I'm in?"

"I don't see anything. Why must you obscure what's as clear as daylight?"

At this juncture there appeared at the doorway of the office a small figure in a black suit and spectacles with gilt frames. It was Ivan Nikodimovich, in charge of the Art Department—"master of life's mishaps" as he was called by the entire works personnel. He brought with him an aroma of ether and paints.

On seeing the "master of mishaps" the deputy director rose from his armchair, and leaning with the tips of his fingers on the writing table, lowered his head like a boxer in the ring. It seemed as though Nikolai Parfenovich would, that very instant, swing himself over the table and dash—perhaps into battle, perhaps into flight.

Ivan Nikodimovich shook hands with Kupin in silence, sank into an armchair and began to wipe his glasses.

Nikolai Parfenovich cast a tragic glance at the deputy State farm director. Its message was clear: "You are about to become the witness of my sufferings. . . ."

"Well, what is it? Out with it", he said, trying to be restrained and drumming nervously on the table with his fingers: "What is it? The stove-setter? A lorry? Planks for the stadium? Linseed oil? A metal roofer? A car to go to the maternity home?"

Ivan Nikodimovich turned to Nikolai Parfenovich.

"What are you getting all worked up about?" he countered calmly.

His calm tone of voice agitated Nikolai Parfenovich all the more.

"I can tell you in advance," he thundered, "there's no transport! It's all out on production and peat. There aren't any joiners. The stove-setters are repairing the boiler-room. The light van's being repaired. There's not a single plank. If I were to die on the spot this very minute there'd not be a board for my coffin. That's that!"

"What *are* you getting excited for?" repeated Ivan Nikodimovich with slow deliberation. "As a member of the Factory Committee I . . ."

"We've heard that! I know! When is it they are re-electing you, you tormentor? There's not a soul but knows you've been fifteen years in succession on the Factory Committee . . ."

"You were a member once, too", said Ivan Nikodimovich, casting a stern glance at the deputy director over his glasses.

"So I was! But I didn't torment the management the way you do . . ."

Ampleyev's speech was cut short by his secretary, who thrust no more than a nose in through the door.

"Ivan Nikodimovich," she whispered, "you're wanted on urgent business."

Ivan Nikodimovich left the room.

"He'll be back", said Nikolai Parfenovich sorrowfully to his visitor, who had been observing the scene in silence. "He's sure to be back . . . you say I don't know why he's come? Just try and refuse him anything! Try it on! Last autumn I held up the linseed oil for the repairs to the factory school, so he complained to the editor of our factory paper. Next day there was an insert on 'Comrade Ampleyev's callous attitude to the school'."

"You should have called the manager of your paper to order. It's undermining the responsibility of the management and all authority. . . . You should have had a talk with the editor . . ." admonished Kupin.

"Have a talk with the editor? I did, believe me, comrade! Such a talk that I even missed my dinner. The editor of the factory paper is my wife. She's a Trubkin! Her grandfather defended the factory against the British and Americans in 1918 when they were advancing from the north . . ."

"Then you should have raised the matter with the Factory Committee", remarked the deputy State farm director, firmly. "Why act the liberal?"

"With the Factory Committee? You saw that old fellow? You saw his important manner when he came into the office? He's the Vice-president of the Committee! And he's my father-in-law! My father-in-law! Can you grasp it? The "exposure" in the press was a minor matter—I must needs get a rebuke into the bargain from the Factory Committee! D'you see? D'you see what a position I'm in? I know what you'll say now. You should have raised it with the Party Committee, you'll say. And perfectly sound too! Perfectly! But Boris Kirdyagin, the secretary, and Hero of the Soviet Union, is my father-in-law's nephew and is married to chief mechanic Ampleyev's daughter. And the father of the secretary of the Party Committee, along with the father of the chief mechanic, built this factory chimney here in the days when my father was a bricklayer. They've been getting crossed and inter-married here for a hundred years till you can't be sure who's an Ampleyev, who's a Kirdyagin and who's a Trubkin! They're all in the family, wherever you turn."

"What on earth's wrong with that?" Kupin was genuinely surprised. "On our State farm, if we . . ."

"Don't you even harbour the idea", said Nikolai Parfenovich interrupted him. "They criticise you just the same. Criticise you so you just don't know what to do. Put yourself in my position. The head of the nursery school is my mother-in-law, Olympiada Nikolaevna Trubkina. I promised her some children's beds for the place. But I didn't get them done. Scandal! All my

relations kicked up a row. And that's nearly the whole factory. Now just imagine: my wife prints an article about me today and tomorrow it's my mother-in-law's name-day. What am I to do? Not go and pay my respects to my mother-in-law because of that insert? They pull you to pieces and don't care if they do cause ill feeling. My father-in-law just turns me into a nervous wreck. Suppose there's some war widow whose roof's out of order. Supposing, in due course, one has to help her. But no, no! That won't do! Immediately, immediately—give her roofing felt, nails and send a roofer on the spot. Someone has a new baby and its grandfather is the best craftsman in the moulding shop and its father in charge of the kaolin pits, fulfilling the plan 160 per cent. At once there's a gift for the infant from the Factory Committee—a cup with a design and inscription: "You will grow up to make better cups than this". And the director's limousine must be sent to the maternity home because the baby's mother is a stakhanovite moulder."

At this moment Ivan Nikodimovich returned. Ampleyev cast an agonised glance at the deputy State farm director—now you'll hear something, he seemed to say.

"Nikolai . . . Nikolai Parfenovich, this is what's up", said the "master of mishaps" quietly. "There are some visitors coming today from the Omelchinsky factory to swap experiences and check the socialist competition agreement . . . so . . ."

"I know! What is it? I've already sent the bus to the station."

"Quite right. We also want to give them a reception, so to speak, at the club. You've been delegated to make the speech of welcome on behalf of the management."

"Speech of welcome? Well, I can . . .", said Nikolai Parfenovich cautiously, sensing that the affair was not going to stop here and that it all reeked of some fresh snare.

"Is that all?" he asked.

"Well, it's like this, you see, it'd be a good thing to give them some hospitality: they're comrades in the same trade and they've got a fine factory too. True, it's not been established long yet—only just twenty-three years old, but they're overfulfilling their plan. Besides, many of our Kirdyagins, Ampleyevs and Trubkins are working there as craftsmen and engineers and their director was formerly one of our workers."

Nikolai Parfenovich gave Ivan Nikodimovich a piercing, murderous look.

"Let the Factory Committee provide the means!"

"The Factory Committee will give something, don't you worry. But the management's got to stump up too."

"Go and see the director! I've no funds at all. Go to the director!"

"Well, that's just what we're asking—we want you to petition the director."

"I'm not going to do any petitioning", declared Ampleyev in final tones.

Ivan Nikodimovich lowered himself into the armchair and began wiping his glasses. This was enough for Nikolai Parfenovich to realise that an overwhelming onslaught was in preparation and he held his breath.

"Parfen Ivanovich, too, asked, *would* you . . .", began Ivan Nikodimovich in a quiet, and it even seemed hesitant, voice.

"Who asked?" came the counter question, as if he had not heard the name.

The "master of mishaps" donned his glasses.

"He asked if you *would*", he repeated without looking at the deputy director.

Nikolai Parfenovich suddenly started gazing at the window with great interest.

“We shan’t be able to give very much”, he remarked, as if in passing. “But we shall, of course, assist the Factory Committee. I’ll have a talk with the director.”

Ivan Nikodimovich went out. There was an awkward silence.

“And who’s this Parfen Ivanovich?” asked Kupin.

“Parfen Ivanovich? He’s our M.P. And my father, incidentally. He runs the Factory Welfare Organisation. That’s how things are. D’you see? And you want me to have some flattering tea services made for your management with gold rims and monograms. You see the situation I’m in. If I were to make those services they’d give me such a turn of their criticism, spoken and printed, that there’d not be a spot in the whole wide world I’d care to live in: “Discrediting his family and his working-class forebears!” the cry would go up. “Disgracing the works!” I’m in a difficult position. I can supply as many cups, plates and dishes as you want for your factory restaurant. But tea services with rims and personal monograms I can’t do. They’re being driven right out . . .”

The deputy State farm director pressed the deputy factory director’s hand in silence.

He left with a sense of grievance.

—Translated by Eric Hartley from *OGONYOK* 1949/22.

By joining the

RUSSIA TODAY BOOK CLUB

you can read the latest Soviet books available in this country at the phenomenally low price of 3/- per month (post free).

Choices to date include :

GUARANTEE OF PEACE, by V. Sobko
LAND IN BLOOM, by V. Safonov
STEEL AND SLAG, by V. Popov
HAPPINESS, by P. Pavlenko
THE ROAD TO LIFE, by Anton Makarenko

Membership 2/6 per year.

FREE membership to members of the British-Soviet Friendship Society, Society for Cultural Relations with the USSR, Scottish-USSR Society.

Full particulars from : 36 Spencer Street, London, E.C.1

(Please enclose stamped addressed envelope)

STOP PRESS :

THE ROAD TO LIFE,
by Anton Makarenko

Three volumes for 8/6 (over 1,000 pages), original photographs

An “EXTRA” choice for Book Club members.

This is the first full-length translation into English of this classic of Soviet education, describing the work with juvenile delinquents in the Soviet Union in the 1920s.

THE WRITER AND THE CONSTRUCTION SCHEMES

By Alexei Surkov

We are proud that we are a literature from the people, about the people, and for the people. The people is not an abstract conception. They can be met in their thousands at literary evenings. We discuss with them over the wireless. Together with them we fought at the front; we met and we meet them on the construction site and in the fields. They read us. They impatiently await our books. They are concerned and worried when any one of their beloved writers is silent for any length of time. They expect much, and are as strict as a father in their criticism. But they are aboundingly generous in the expression of their love and confidence in literature and in their writers. They want to see themselves in literature. They ask that literature shall help them to live and build their future. Our dependence on the people is not a burden which shackles the freedom of the individual and of creativeness. It is the only way to create freely and inspiringly, to comprehend the reason for one's existence on earth.

—ALEXEI SURKOV, October 22, 1949, at the Rudolf Steiner Hall, London; full speech reprinted in *ANGLO-SOVIET JOURNAL*, Vol. X, No. 4.

DISCUSSION on the part played by writers in the great construction schemes of communism should start by recalling the tasks of literature as formulated in the Communist Party's decisions on literature in connection with the journals *Zvezda* and *Leningrad*.

I think it apposite to recall those words, and those of the Communist Party's decisions on the film *The Great Life*, in this article, because we are still suffering from many failures and disappointing shortcomings, notwithstanding a flow of good books which are worthy of the demands made on them by our Soviet reality.

When we stop to think about the tasks we are set, of the truly titanic and epic scale of the five great construction sites of communism, we naturally realise that such large-scale construction undertakings by the Soviet state do not mark a mere further step along our road to communism. On the contrary. We may regard our work as the expression of a qualitatively new stage in the

development of Soviet society in its advance towards Communism. This is one of the great epochs in our history. Stages such as this determine for a good while to come the most important formative processes in the growth of Soviet literature.

If we look back on our past we can see that, by the very nature of the Soviet state and of the new nature of Soviet literature, every decisive period of our society's development has imprinted a sharp and clearly distinguishable mark on the development of literature.

The first period in our socialist society's existence, linked with the October 1917 victory, produced in the 1920s a good deal of literature inspired primarily by the great events of the Civil War. Similarly, we can discern that a new and important stage in the history of Soviet literature began in the late 1920s and early 1930s when with the adoption of the first Five-Year Plan our society entered upon a new and decisive phase of its advance to socialism.

When a new stage begins a good deal of the previous subject matter disappears, withers away or undergoes sharp changes in form. This is the fate that befell the subject of the attitude of the intellectual towards the revolution, a common theme in the 1920s. This theme may be seen in Fedin's novels *Towns and Years* and *Brothers*, in Malyshkin's *Sevastopol*, in Sobolev's *Capital Repairs*, in Olesha's *Envy* and *List of Blessings*, in the poems of Ilya Selvinsky, and in many other works.

The decisive turning point as regards intellectuals was fixed by our great successes in Socialist construction during the first Five-Year Plans and by our successes in the transformation of social and productive relations in town and village.

Not only was the attitude of the older generation of intellectuals towards Soviet society changed. The very scale of Socialist construction gave birth to a new generation of intellectuals formed by Socialism, a generation that was flesh of the flesh and bone of the bone of our young Socialist society.

During that period a whole range of subjects, characteristic of the 1920s, disappeared from our literature. At first such books as *Blast Furnace*, by N. Lyashko, and F. Gladkov's *Cement* (which laid the way for the appearance of the industrial theme in literature) were very rare among the books devoted to the heroic deeds of the Civil War.

During the Five-Year Plans the latter gradually gave way to books whose subject-matter was the creative present of our Soviet socialist society.

At the present time, when discussing the part to be played by writers in the great undertakings of today, we should bear in mind what happened at the end of the 1920s and the beginning of the 30s.

The events of that time determined the further development of prose, poetry and drama; and the creative future of many writers was decisively altered as a result, a fact of which you need no reminder.

Allow me to recall *Virgin Soil Upturned*, by M. Sholokhov; the second and third parts of F. Panferov's *Bruski*; *Hatred*, by I. Shukhov; I. Ehrenburg's *The Second Day* and *Without Drawing Breath*; *Skutarevsky, Sot*, and *The Road to the Ocean*, by L. Leonov; V. Katayev's *Forward, oh Time!* *Night of Tragedy*, by A. Bezimensky; *Song of the Hatchet*, *My Friend* and other plays by N. Pogodin; the outstanding poem *Mother*, by N. Dementyev, who was virtually dragged out of an aesthete's stuffy and timorous little world by the life at the Bobrikovsky combine during the first Five-Year Plan.

In that period also were published F. Gladkov's *Energy*, M. Shaginyan's *Hydrocentral*, A. Tvardovsky's *Land of the Ants* and a huge number of novels, poems, short stories, plays and verses which showed not only a change in subject matter, not only use by the writer of fresh material, but also a new approach to this material.

There can be no doubt what very fruitful results to their theoretical analyses and conclusions would accrue to our literary theoreticians if they would only, at long last, turn to solving the complex problems of the formation of socialist-realist methods and to settling the question of how writers of different calibre and quality achieved a mastery of the socialist-realist method during the first Five-Year Plan.

The new subject-matter resulted in the development of a new quality in the books of those years, and the work of many writers stood infinitely higher in ideological content and artistic skill than had their work in the 1920s, including the titles I have listed and many others, notwithstanding individual shortcomings, sometimes very great.

People's vision and view of the world altered. What happened to Ilya Ehrenburg is very characteristic in this respect. After holding for a long while what I regard as a rather dubious position, and observing the happenings of the 1920s in our country from the side-lines, as it were, Ehrenburg came into contact with everyday reality during the first Five-Year Plan and then not only wrote books differing sharply from everything characteristic of his previous stage of creative work, but may be said to have been re-born. And I would say that it was this re-birth that to a large extent determined the new alignment for his creative future, a new alignment that was to show itself so powerfully—particularly during the Great Patriotic War and in the post-war years.

V. Katayev's work at Magnitostroi for *Forward, oh Time!* was a very fundamental period for his creative development. The writing of *Virgin Soil Uplifted* was for Sholokhov not only a change-over to new material and new subject-matter; this work made him leave the theme of *Quiet Flows the Don*, which he wrote at the same time as *Virgin Soil Uplifted*, and helped him to enter into a world of new social relations, which—possibly from their very novelty—were not sufficiently clear to Sholokhov in the material on the Civil War and the pre-Revolutionary life of the Don Cossacks. The same may be said of many books of that period and of the profound reorientation that writers underwent at that time.

This was a very positive stage in the development of Soviet literature, one which determined its further development. Nor is it an accident that this stage coincided with the dissolution of R.A.P.P. The reason for the writers' inward reorientation, which was to be seen in their work during these years, naturally led also to the necessity of breaking with out-of-date and narrow organisational forms in literature. Everything which was harmful, unnecessary or hampering in its path of development had to be done away with.

It was the lively participation of our writers and intellectuals in helping to carry out the very new and long-term plans for socialist construction that determined the Union of Soviet Writers' programme of work, and made it possible for us in 1934 to formulate, with Party assistance, the basic principles of the socialist-realist method, principles which arose from our day-to-day creative experience of those years.

The writers' direct participation in the people's creative life helped to prepare us for the fine work done by Soviet literature during the Great Patriotic War.

If our literature had not had a deep understanding of the very nature of our new reality, an understanding reflected in the books written in the decade before the war, if understanding had not extended to a profound daily knowledge of Soviet man's new traits of character and behaviour (this knowledge the writer could only acquire from his living experience of exchanging ideas with the actual builders of socialism): then our literature might have shown itself incapable of the unified, purposeful and patriotic drive which it displayed from the very first days of the war. It might not have understood its tasks so

clearly and profoundly, it might not have shown itself so entirely and staunchly convinced of the invincibility of our social order.

All these qualities, which made of our literature in the war years, in Mayakovsky's words *both bomb and banner*, would never have shown up so clearly without the rich accumulated experience of the previous years.

The first post-war years witnessed a stagnation, a marking-time, when we discovered a certain falling off in the unified and resilient nature which Soviet literature had had both in the war years and in pre-war years. And it was this situation which produced in 1946 the now historic Resolution of the Central Committee on ideological questions, and the resolution on *Zvezda* and *Leningrad*.

The five years which today separate us from these historic decisions have shown that our literature—by virtue of its own nature and of the experience of previous years—is capable of raising its creative level.

The post-war years have been marked by widespread innovation in our literature. It has turned its attention to the most stirring contemporary subjects. The task of restoring everything destroyed by the war, and the creative tasks carried out by the whole nation in the first post-war Five-Year Plan, had become the central theme of Soviet post-war literature as early as 1946. This theme ran parallel to the urgent and equally vital task of struggling for peace and exposing the warmongers.

When, therefore, we raise the question of what creative resources we have in our literature at the present stage in the nation's life, we can quite correctly reply: on the threshold of this great new epoch, literature has emerged sufficiently well equipped by past experiences and by new experiences in the use of the principal trends of the present day.

Were an analysis to be made, however, of books written in the post-war period, there would become very apparent a certain disproportion, if I may use the word, in the attention our Soviet writers pay to varying aspects of Soviet reality.

The collective farm has been a particularly "happy" subject since the war. This subject, and the living material in the collective farm village, have formed the basis of a number of outstanding and memorable Soviet novels, well received by a wide public. This cannot be said of other material, of problems connected with the life of our Socialist cities and with that of our working class. The working class has not, on the whole, fared very well in our literature over the past thirty-three years. This must be frankly and honestly admitted. Works on the leading class of our society, the class that is the strength of our reality, can be counted in tens, and none too high at that. This was substantially so before the war and there has unfortunately been no real change since the war. We have not yet mastered this vital theme with as much intensity as the Soviet reader is entitled to expect of us. This question emerges with particular clarity when we speak of the tasks facing us as regards the great construction sites of communism.

What new principles are being introduced into our lives by the great canal and irrigation schemes, the hydro-electric schemes on the Amu-Darya, on the Volga at Stalingrad and Kuibyshev, on the Dnieper at Kakhovka and on the Don at Tsimlyanskaya?

(Surkov then goes on to quote the plan figures for increasing the irrigated areas, the use of electric power and so on, comparing today's plans with 1913 in Tsarist Russia and with the first three Five-Year Plans, showing the great scope and scale of the new works.)

But Soviet people are not content with this. There are enthusiasts among us who are already thinking out schemes which are so vast as to make even the current plans appear modest!

We have scientists who are already working on the problem of damming the Ob and the Yenisei so that these great rivers cease to pour their tremendous water resources into the Arctic. These people are planning how to turn the Ob and Yenisei southwards and use their waters for the vast areas of Central Asia burnt black by the sun, and choked with sand. And these people have tentatively calculated that were such a plan to be carried through, it would be possible to feed and clothe 400 million people from the lands wrested from the desert.

There is one particular feature of these new construction sites that I would like to dwell on. All the gigantic things we have already built, we built by the efforts of the entire people, a unified co-ordination of our national economy, based on Socialist planning. The five great new construction sites of communism, however, extend over a front broader than anything we have ever known. The forward line runs through Stalingrad, Kuibyshev, Kakhovka and Takhia-Tash, but in depth the front extends into the remotest parts of our land. There is not a single factory that has not been linked in one way or another with these sites. The gigantic scales of these undertakings and the unparalleled extent of mechanisation are determined by the great development of industry and its high technical level, its enormously increased ability to put the boldest of technical ideas into practice.

Everything has to be calculated : the changes in climate, the direction of future forest belts, the danger of possible salt-accumulation in the soil ; all other dangers have to be estimated to bring natural processes into the correct course : all this results in such a gigantic complex of effort as, in carrying out the great tasks of the earlier stages of our history of construction, we have never known before.

If all these facts are really understood as constituting aspects of a truly new stage on our path of advance to Communism, then study of these five great construction schemes will be regarded as it should be. This does not mean five or six literary missions [*komandirovki*] each lasting one or two months. It is a much more profound and fundamental matter in each individual writer's work and also one on which the future of our literature for the coming years will depend.

Are we, or are we not, going to understand the new happenings as reflected in these five construction sites of communism and the problems arising from them ? That is the point.

If we fail to understand them then we shall do petty work and the reader will pass us by. In order to understand and feel all this, it does not amount to much for an artist to know it intellectually, to tabulate figures ; the artist needs to observe and feel it all, and to observe it *whole*, and deeply, and he must understand all this through people, I repeat, through people ! Reports on how much soil a walking excavator clears in a shift, or how much soil is shifted by the suction-dredger, can be written merely by reading up newspaper or magazine items. But all these walking excavators, all these suction-dredgers, are to a writer simply a mirror in which a man with a new nature is already to be seen.

The scale and scope of these construction sites, the speed of work, the tasks set our present levels of mechanisation—all these factors will, in turn, exert a formative influence on the development of the character of the people who are working on these sites ; they will widen their mental horizons and develop the emotional side of each man's personality. And man in his turn will set the imprint of his personality on the entire character of this construction work.

The problem of the writer's participation in the great construction sites of communism must not be discussed as a mere transient campaign. The matter

does not consist merely in the compilation by editorial boards of a long list of people to be sent to the construction sites. People may go and spend a certain amount of time on the construction sites and come back with some unripe fruits, and then we shall see some statistics, to wit, "872 works on the great construction sites have appeared in the journals!", and we shall consider our task fulfilled. Certainly, I am simplifying the matter somewhat, but there may arise a real danger of writers making unnecessary journeys.

Writers, on arriving at a factory or a construction site, say "Let me have heroes!" When a newspaper man says this, having come for three days, he is right in his own way. He has got to get down an outline urgently and give information. But this is no way for a writer to work. A writer must himself draw the attention of the director or the construction foreman to the people on the job that he finds outstanding.

In 1939-40 I worked for four months with a group of Moscow writers on a small army newspaper on the Finnish front. All the outstanding personalities of our front who later became medallists and Heroes of the Soviet Union had, in the first instance, appeared in our columns. We "sought them out" in the companies and battalions and attracted the entire army's attention to them.

This is a matter of principle and is, I think, more or less fundamental. When leaving for the Volga or the Dnieper the writer must decide for himself what he is to do there. If I went to a construction site, I would go to the management and say, "Give me a job as a propagandist". As such I should be able to go from team to team on the construction sites, talk to people, explain what is not clear to them, get them to speak frankly as man to man, and try to make myself one of them. I should thus win the moral right to write at first hand, and not from the sidelines, about people on the construction job.

We need to reflect carefully on this important question: In what capacity do we arrive on these sites? Are we to be emissaries and permanent or temporary jurymen, or are we to take direct part in the work in hand?

In my opinion our primary task today is to see that people display an understanding of the whole significance to Soviet literature of the great construction sites of Communism. We can take very direct part in this great task as an ideological detachment of the builders of Communism.

And so for those whose consciousness in this matter is already mature, who understand that it is impossible to live in literature without lively participation in any great task, for such people it is our duty to create the best possible conditions to enter into the life of the great construction sites and of the human collective on these sites.

*Translated and slightly abridged from
ZNAMYA, 1951/6, by Eleanor Fox.*

THE BUILDERS OF KAKHOVKA

By V. Druzhinin

WHAT are the builders of Kakhovka like? There are, it seems, still people—writers and journalists—whose attitude towards publicising the activities of workers on the construction sites is wholly irresponsible; they treat the whole matter of getting to know the great construction schemes as if it were a cavalry sortie.

In the July 21 issue of the Kherson regional newspaper *The Upper Dnieper Pravda*, there appeared a lengthy sketch by M. Reznitsky, entitled

Piotr Kovalev, Communist Stonemason. Into the mouth of this well-known stonemason the author of the piece puts completely imaginary words : “ Having no trade [!], I worked on various odd jobs at first. I watched the stonemasons working and decided I could do as well as they did. . . . For a long while [!] I didn’t dare [!] ask for a job on my own, but at last I made up my mind the time had come to take the plunge [!], as they say. . . . My application was granted and I became a stonemason . . . ”

This write-up of M. Reznitsky’s presents Piotr Kovalev as a diffident sort of person. In fact, Kovalev is quite different. What is he really like ? Piotr Afanasievich Kovalev was born in 1920 in the village of Storino, in the Smolensk Region, and grew up fatherless. Thanks to the Soviet collective-farm system, he had seven years’ schooling, and studied at a tractor-driving school and a mechanics school. He worked as lorry driver, as tractor driver and as harvest-combine driver, and also in a garage and as a seventh-grade fitter.

During the war he served as a reconnaissance scout, and captured ninety-seven “tongues”† in eighteen months; he fought through the Ukraine, Rumania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Austria, and was decorated many times. Seven times wounded, he rose from the rank of private to that of lieutenant, and in the last years of the war was deputy-commander of the reconnaissance H.Q. During his army service he became a communist.

The reader will note that his character is by no means “diffident”. On the contrary : courage, and the ability to get his bearings in an unfamiliar and complex situation, are characteristic of him as of most of our young people.

After the war he taught in a seven-year school in the Smolensk Region as physical culture instructor. His work in helping the collective farmers to improve their organisation resulted in his being elected secretary of the local party organisation, which covered seven collective farms.

“It was pretty hard work,” says Kovalev, “especially as the farms were widely scattered. All the same, I was able to recuperate from my wounds. Built a house for the family, planted twenty apple trees in my garden ; they started bearing fruit last year. We bought a cow and a young pig, and Lydia—my wife—kept chickens. Well, it was home ; you know. We were as happy as could be. Mikhail and Viktor—our boys—were growing up nicely. Misha’s very good at his lessons. I used to go through them with him and look over his homework every day. It got to be such a family habit that if ever I wasn’t at home little Vitya used to say : ‘Misha, let’s have a look at your lesson books ; I’ll go over them with you.’ The teachers used to come round to our place in the evenings and we all had heated arguments about scientific developments and new books and international affairs. I often used to speak at farm meetings. Still, it used to seem to me sometimes that I was having too much of a quiet life, not doing enough for the future, for my country. After the war I paid a visit to Moscow, and to Leningrad too. I’ve got plenty of ex-army friends there. I saw how quickly our socialist industry was developing and our towns growing, with my own eyes. Felt I ought to be doing more myself. In the end I couldn’t stand it any more, so I took myself off to the Donbas and went to work in the pits. Got a job as a member of an underground work team. We turned out a good lot of coal ; I earned as much as 5,000 roubles a month. It was interesting work ; some of the finest machinery in the world to handle. I love machines : when I was only a kid I used to vanish for days on end so as to be near the tractors. Well, about a year ago the papers started printing the Council of Ministers’ decisions about the great construction sites. They had a great effect on me ; I felt very proud of my country as a bulwark of peace. And the thought kept on bothering me and nagging at me : I must get out there, I must get on to those construction sites . . . ”

On April 3, 1951, Piotr Kovalev was one of the first party of builders to

† Prisoners taken to secure information.

leave for the shifting sands near the village of Kluchevoye, twelve kilometres [$7\frac{1}{2}$ miles] from Kakhovka. There was a keen east wind blowing, smothering everybody in sand and blotting out the sun in a cloud of dust. The site of the future new city was unapproachable by car: the first building materials had to be brought up by tractor. It all seemed to bear not the slightest resemblance to the scale and scope of a future great construction site. They started by building a foreman's hut and pouring the first concrete for the foundations. The sun glared down, the dust tasted bitter in the mouth and stung the eyes. There was not a scrap of shade anywhere. Here and there complaining voices were to be heard: "We thought . . ." "It isn't what we expected . . ." "What earthly use are my qualifications in a place like this?" and so forth.

Kovalev, in the light of his past experience of organising, used to answer: "What on earth did you expect? Did you think the construction sites of communism would start out with full communism first go off? Why this construction site is called *great* is because working on it means overcoming great obstacles, tremendous obstacles." And Kovalev was the first to take up a spade, the first to start work on the heavy stones needed for the foundations; he inspired the builders by his example.

That was on April 3. On the 15th of May, Kovalev's team of stonemasons began the even-flow construction of prefabricated houses for the new socialist city, Novaya Kakhovka.

There was not the slightest reason for write-up man Reznitsky to be astounded at Kovalev's mastering the trade of stonemason on the spot within three months. The advantage of the even-flow method, introduced on all construction schemes by a Ukrainian Academy of Architecture team, is precisely the fact that any worker can begin working as a stonemason or a carpenter from his very first day of work. To fail to observe this on our site is to fail to observe what is as plain as the nose on your face.

The builders of the Kakhovka hydro-electric power station were quick to assess and appreciate Kovalev. In July he was elected chairman of a shop trade-union committee covering nearly 300 workers. At trade union and party meetings he has more than once made sharp and effective criticisms of the economists and government workers on the job. You have only to look at him—tall and straight, serious and reserved, walking firmly about the site in his neat blue overalls and broad-brimmed straw hat—to feel sure that he is anything but one of the "diffident" squad!

Why then did Reznitsky find it necessary to describe him as a forgotten little man, diffidently wondering how he might become a specialist, how to "take the plunge"?

Perhaps the write-up man did not manage to have a real good talk with Kovalev, and the latter, with innate modesty, saw no need to brag about his work.

But why did not Reznitsky talk to the work teams, the economists, the social workers on the section? In his write-up, the author has unjustifiably belittled the character of one of the finest and best-known people on our construction site.

Unfortunately, other Kakhovka write-ups have also suffered from faults and shortcomings of this kind. We are waiting for our writers and reporters; we say to them: Come to Kakhovka, help us to get to know our builders. But do not forget that the worker of today, our Soviet worker of the second half of the twentieth century, is quite different from what he used to be when industrialisation first dawned. The face of our working class has vastly changed. Our worker today is not what he was yesterday, and tomorrow he will be other than he is today. Tomorrow we are to raise our people to the next stage. It is for you to help us in this work, comrade writers!

—Slightly abridged from *LITERATURNAYA GAZETA*, 21.8.51

ASJ MOSCOW LETTER

From Ralph Parker



MOSCOW'S NEW BUILDINGS AND THEIR BUILDERS

IN a conspectus of 1951 I would say that it was the architects' year. Not only for what they have finished or were planning during the year but because it is in their branch of the arts that one has seen most serious development in the direction of solving the problems of the times. Though architecture was not specifically referred to in the series of statements about the arts and sciences that have been issued by the Communist Party since the war, a great deal of discussion of principles has been going on in architectural circles. As in other fields, the authority of established reputations has frequently been challenged by the younger generation, often from centres outside Moscow or Leningrad, a number of "cliques" have had to break up and there have been important organisational changes in accordance with the growth of Soviet society. To use a term the meaning of which is well understood here, architects have been adapting themselves to the tasks of the advance towards Communism.

To appreciate the situation, it is necessary to go back a little in time. Limiting our view to Moscow, we see, beginning with the 1930s, an industrial expansion which led to the capital producing about one-seventh of the USSR's entire industrial output. The provision of housing for over one million new workers and their families made great demands on the builders. Before the Revolution about a half of Moscow's working folk were peasants who left their families in the villages and slept in doss houses and dormitories, usually on the city outskirts. Many of these workers, perhaps as many as half a million, moved into better quarters immediately after the Revolution, generally bringing their families with them. Thus you had that characteristic, though temporary, feature of the first decade of Soviet Moscow, the former middle-class apartment or nobleman's mansion shared by several families, with a common kitchen and so on. The period has its own literature, its customs and, one might also say, its folk-lore.

To check the danger of overcrowding the authorities introduced stringent sanitary regulations and began building new houses for the hundreds of thousands of new workers who continued to pour into Moscow until late in the 1930s. Many of these houses were built by the factories for their own workers, and today, if you examine the biographies of leading skilled workers in the Stalin Automobile Works, the Dynamo Factory, the Calibre Works and others, you will find that many of them began their working days in Moscow as bricklayers or plasterers or navvies building their own homes. Rough and ready as many of these tenements were, they were an advance on village conditions and far better than the places in which most Moscow workers lived before 1917. Above all, they enabled families to be united.

Take for example the story of the Bardybakhin family. The first Bardybakhin brought his son Kondrati to Moscow some sixty years ago and worked as a weaver in the mill of *Widow Rybakov and Sons*. The two men lived in a dormitory in Marina Roshcha, a suburb of Moscow. On holidays they walked back to their native village, forty miles away. There Kondrati's wife Yekaterina bore him five sons. After the Revolution the whole family came to Moscow and in turn each of the five young men went to work at the factory that later became known as the Stalin Automobile Works. They built and lived in a house that belonged to the factory. In 1918,

however, the eldest son, Ivan, was already learning his trade as an electrician. At the outbreak of the war he and his four brothers were highly skilled workers. To complete their story, all joined up in 1941. The youngest, Alexei, a fitter, was killed at Rzhev; Ivan commanded a unit on the Volokolamsk front; Alexander took part in the defence of Sevastopol, and Peter and Nikolai fought their way to Berlin, where they wrote the name Bardybakhin on the sooty walls of the Reichstag. Today there are no less than fifteen members of the family at the Stalin Automobile Works. One of Ivan's daughters is a designer and a second-year student at the works' technical school. Her cousin, Nina, also in the designing department, is soon taking her examinations to become a qualified engineer. Another Bardybakhin is a technologist and at the same time a fifth-year student in the philological faculty of Moscow University. Anatoli Bardybakhin holds the national championship in classical style wrestling.

How has Moscow's growth kept pace with the advance of this typical working family, whose members, naturally, expect quite different living conditions from those of the first twenty-five years of the Soviet State? They have broken off their roots in the village and have become city dwellers. And this means that in addition to libraries, sports fields, theatres and cinemas, clubs and parks, they have become accustomed to permanent homes in the capital, where they can bring up their families and accumulate personal property.

The first stage in the reconstruction of the city began in the mid-1930s with the drawing up of a ten-year development plan. This plan envisaged two phases of work: first the provision of what might be called the foundations of the city—communications, water supply, public buildings such as schools, libraries, health centres, sports facilities; and second, permanent housing. The war meant a postponement of the second phase by about ten years, but at its outbreak most of the first phase had been completed. The river embankments had been built and the flood danger finally averted, many of the principal streets were widened—sometimes by the ingenious process of dragging back the buildings on rails—hundred of schools had been built, the Dynamo sports centre finished and a start made on the Ismailovo stadium, most of the suburban lines electrified, a chain of parks opened, the main lines of the underground railway finished, and the river port opened on the new Moscow-Volga canal.

There is much to be learned about the intentions of the builders of Moscow by a comparison of the quality of workmanship and constructional material in three categories of building—the great factories and ministerial buildings erected some twenty years ago, the houses that went up at the same time to provide for the influx of new workers, and the public works of the late 1930s. The factories and ministerial buildings are functional in design, solidly built and have lasted well, whereas the housing of the same period, rather utilitarian in style, is now revealed as being of mainly stop-gap character. Structural alterations and improvements in the surroundings have done much to remove the raw quality of the work, but post-war house-building has provided clear evidence that the standards set twenty years ago were not ultimate ones. When one comes to examine the constructions in the third category, however, one at once recognises that the architects and builders of the Metro, the Canal, the Lenin Library, schools, and so on, were looking far ahead. Their work showed that, given the materials and the skilled hands, Soviet building was of a quality to match that of any other city in the world.

In the post-war period these qualitative standards have been applied to the new housing: and, to ensure their being attained, the Moscow building industry and the architectural apparatus have been radically transformed.

Once house-building was promoted to the top priority previously reserved for public building such as the Metro and the schools, the building industry began to receive marks of attention. Institutes and technical schools were organised in the city to train the workers in new methods of industrial construction, and began to attract workers from all over the Soviet Union. Whole housing estates were built to accommodate them. Limestone quarries in the Moscow region were reopened, Caucasian, Karelian and Urals granite was earmarked for the capital, the brickworks were reorganised to enable them to go on supplying the city's needs during the winter, many new factories were opened to prepare mechanised aids to building and to manufacture prefabricated parts. Above all, teams of scientists were set to work on the problems of building and their inventions brought to the attention of the various organisations concerned with building by the enlargement of the permanent building exhibition. At the same time every effort was made to stimulate innovations among the building workers. At every site an inventions office was opened to receive the workers' suggestions and to enable them to be made generally available. In this way such inventions as metal-tube containers for delivering bricks in bulk from the works to the bricklayer without a single handling were widely introduced. It was from the bricklayers, too, that there came such innovations as the "team of five" and the "team of four", where one skilled bricklayer led a group of beginners, who in turn left him to lead new teams. With the disappearance of the hod and the wheelbarrow there also went the familiar "bricklayer and his mate".

Consider, for example, the progress of Alexander Leontiev, who is now working on an eight-storey house in Levitan Street. He began to work as an apprentice bricklayer in 1928, at which time the bricklaying work on one storey of a new house on the Bolshoi Usachevsky street kept sixty qualified men busy for a week. Leontiev now leads one of three teams of five who are building a storey every week. Every year about twelve youngsters qualify in these teams and are replaced by unskilled workers. Or take the case of Alexei Listratov, whose schooling was interrupted by the war. He had four years at the front and became a building worker after demobilisation. In the evenings he attended a School for Working Youth, matriculated and entered the Building Institute of the Moscow Soviet, where he has been studying for three years, on his way to becoming an engineer.

Among the changes made in the architects' work was the appointment of leading architects to posts in charge of the development of different sectors of the city. These sectors are named after the principal highways that cross them. It will be recalled that the Plan for Moscow envisages these highways, which radiate from the city centre along the traces of ancient roads, being developed according to unified plans to be applied along their length to a distance of some thirty-five miles into the country. Thus, Alabyan has been put in charge of the Leningrad and Volokolamsk highways which fork on the city's outskirts. His designs include a large complex of buildings at this fork intended to house the Planning Offices of the Hydro-Electric Projects Administration. Zakharov has the Southern Highway, which links the city with the long-distance motor road to the Crimea. Andreyev has the Yaroslav highway to develop. It passes the new Botanical Gardens of the Academy of Sciences and the site of the pre-war Agricultural Exhibition, which will be used again later this year for an exhibition of the country's achievements during the three-year-plan for stock-raising and dairy farming, the success of which is now assured. Most of the new housing estates lie just off these highways, close to the main lines of communication.

The most convincing proof of the new standard of housing construction, a standard at least on a par with that of the "foundations" of Moscow I have

referred to above, is provided by the seven skyscrapers on which work began two or three years ago. The description of these buildings as "skyscrapers" is avoided here because they have nothing but their great height in common with the tall buildings of New York and elsewhere. Until they were built, modern Moscow lacked a marked vertical dimension. Its church towers, which had once dominated separate neighbourhoods, had long been over-topped by apartment houses, many of them flat-roofed. Now, however, the spires of the new multi-storey buildings soar above the city. Indeed, during the past twelve months Moscow has been given a new outline, for these buildings are not concentrated in one or two areas but have been placed far apart, to affect the skyline over a distance of several miles. And each building is to be the centre of a system of parks and squares which will enable them to be seen as a whole. Around the new university buildings on the Lenin Hills, for example, there will extend a city park of over two hundred acres, while the new buildings on the river front will be approached by embankments and terraces.

The first of the new high buildings to be finished was the one on the Kotelnicheskaya Embankment. It occupies a site close to the outlet of the river Yauza into the river Moskva about half a mile from the battlemented walls of the Kremlin. Up till about fifteen years ago this was an ugly and unhealthy part of Moscow, where the ragged edges of two or three city districts met in a marsh. Steep narrow streets ran down from Taganka (Trivet) Hill, others wound off to cross the Inner Ring and enter the district of the former Khitrov Market, the setting of Maxim Gorky's play *The Lower Depths*. In accordance with the 1935 reconstruction plan there was a good deal of tidying up, and when the Moskva river was embanked and the Yauza confined to a narrow cement-lined canal, a large square was laid out just behind the Kotelnicheskaya Embankment. On the river front a ten-storey block of flats was built, but there was not time to face its bricks before the war began. The square remained incomplete, lined with small houses and its breadth, together with the imposing lines of the new bridge spanning the river, only served to add to the impression of unfinished plans.

When, in 1948, the plans for the eight new multi-storey buildings were published, one of them dealt with the development of the Kotelnicheskaya Embankment as a residential area. Its principal feature was the construction of a thirty-two-storey building with wings, of which the existing block on the river front was to be one. The entire building was to be reserved for private apartments of two, three and four rooms, for like the other multi-storey buildings, two of them hotels, one the university and students' hostel (6,000 single rooms), two apartment houses and three mixed offices and flats, the Kotelnicheskaya Embankment building was designed to meet the housing shortage.

When I visited this new building recently I approached it from the Inner Ring, a boulevard lined in this district with handsome early-nineteenth-century houses. Still far from the river, I could see the graceful central tower, a creamy white in colour, topped by a slender steeple that links it architecturally with the Kremlin. I crossed the Yauza, where pack-ice was slowly drifting. There were big grey Asiatic ravens perched on the ice. Workmen were still improving the immediate approaches to the tall oaken doors of the main vestibule. Others were polishing the pink marble that faces the lower floors. Panels of sculpture and metal work have been set in it.

The first (and lasting) impression of the new structure is the simplicity of its lines. By this I do not mean that the building is monolithic. Its ground plan, star-shaped, is highly complex and covers a large area, for it has been the aim of its architects, A. K. Rostovsky and D. N. Chechulin, to provide as much surface as possible in order that all its seven hundred apartments should receive sunshine and air. The simplicity is in the smooth unbroken face of

the building. As constructional material has improved, and panels of ceramics, alabaster and limestone are produced in uniform sizes by the factories, the architects have been able to dispense with those fussy details and ornamental pillars with which blemishes used to be concealed. The facing of this building is a ceramic that was tested by firing at a temperature of 1,200 degrees, then by deep freezing five times. The architects are confident that it will last hundreds of years. That fact in itself is enough to illustrate the different approach to building this house compared with that made by the builders twenty years ago.

I went into the main vestibule. Here are grouped the main service departments for the tenants, an automatic telephone exchange with 1,000 numbers, storage rooms for bicycles and perambulators, post office, bookshop, and so on. Underneath is the garage. An escalator runs up to the second floor where the lifts start. We travel to the twenty-sixth floor in forty seconds, silently, comfortably, with an amazing panorama of Moscow seen through the lift's open sides. We emerge on one of the roof gardens, with a surface of foam glass spread over aluminium foil. An electric "broom" is being run over the snow which, as it melts, runs away through pipes let into the walls.

We enter an apartment which is almost ready for occupation. There are double doors and inside there is complete silence although outside workmen are laying a marble floor. The windows, too, are double-framed, with a rather wider separation than is usual in Moscow. We are in a three-room flat. Although the furniture is not yet installed it is so well provided with "fixtures" that one has an impression that it is almost ready for occupation. There is a long mirror fixed in the hall with a small table and bench in front of it. There are burnished copper lamp brackets. The bathroom has built-in linen cupboards with a current of hot air, a sunken bath, chromium-plated fittings, concealed lighting. The kitchen has both summer and winter refrigerators, a vacuum cleaner, a hermetically sealed rubbish chute.

The walls of the living rooms are surfaced with a hard, semi-matt washable plaster in various pastel shades. The steam-heating units are concealed. There are built-in cupboards in the hall for storing winter clothes, a dark room for amateur photographers—refinements that would have been altogether exceptional before the war but which are becoming normal in houses being built throughout the Soviet Union. For it must be understood that the Kotelnicheskaya Embankment house is not a block of "luxury flats" but the first of a series of buildings which are intended to rehouse tens of thousands of families every year.

Progress in house-building is not adequately described by the rise from 405,000 square metres of living-room space finished in 1948, to 535,000 in 1950 and 735,000 in 1951. A steep qualitative rise has accompanied this advance, and in this rise the architects have had their say, insisting on more attention being paid to comfort and convenience. Instead of the abrupt change from street to room, in no way helped by the gloomy unheated staircases and vestibules of houses of the older style, they have turned their attention to the "approach to the home", as Ivan Zholtovsky calls it. "Through a gradual change in surroundings the house-dweller must feel he is approaching a place of comfort and repose. This feeling should come over him as soon as he enters the garden." This is an altogether new concept of the Russian house, however familiar it may be in other lands, and its application is leading to substantial improvement in the appearance of Moscow, to the building of garden suburbs like the one near Ismailovo Park and to radical improvements in the courtyards of the workers' flats near the Stalin Automobile Plant, where one now finds open-air gymnastic corners, children's sandpits and, of course, the little tables under the lime trees for the chess and dominoes players.

SOVIET ECONOMY

By Maurice Dobb

THIS massive book,* though it contains little that is original in the way of interpretation, or even (with one or two exceptions) of descriptive material, manages to assemble a considerable wealth of factual information, not ordinarily accessible, in its 570-odd pages of text. The Preface claims it to be “a synthesis of available knowledge”. In form and presentation it bears the familiar stamp of the American textbook, thinly disguised by a Jonathan Cape wrapper and imprint. Textbooks have their obvious uses; and this one is an impressive compilation in range as well as in mere size. But American textbooks seem very much to run to type—slick and efficient, with their short paragraphs and neat section-labels, systematic, comprehensive and popular, they tend to lack depth or subtlety, and sometimes discrimination, and to show signs of hasty composition and a “typewriter-style”. This book shares the efficiency, and also in varying degrees several of the defects, of its type; although one should add that it is better written and more readable than most. In the present-day near-war atmosphere in the the U.S.A. much of the book might be regarded as an objective study of “the enemy”, fair after its fashion. In some of the chapters the factual description, indeed, is objective enough. But in his comment, of which he is not sparing, the author does not hesitate to make clear on which side of the “cold war” he is mobilised, and to eschew the epithet of “neutralist”; and lest the Senator McCarthys should have any doubts as to the uses which the book can serve, the well-known anti-Soviet journalist W. H. Chamberlin supplies a Foreword devoted to dotting the *i*'s and crossing the *t*'s of the more propagandist implications of the book. The author himself is not altogether averse to pepping up his work with a fairly liberal sprinkling of *obiter dicta* couched in emotive language (of which the following are samples: “the consumer is the forgotten man in the Soviet Union”; “trade unions in Russia are unrecognisable by Western standards”; “coercion allied with planning”; “a population cowed”; “workers' chains compare with the worst abuses of peonage”).

The book opens with three chapters respectively entitled “The Resource Background”, “The Historical Background”, “The Ideological Background”. The first of these is interesting and informative; the second is mainly a summary condensation of such authors as Mavor, Tanquary Robinson and Liashchenko; in the third the author does his best to be fair in his description of Marxism so far as his understanding of it will allow, although this latter limitation gives rise to a number of defects, as for instance his superficial handling of the “prices of production” analysis of Marx (leading up to the conclusion that this “in effect abandons all effort to explain the actual market exchange rates in terms of labour”). In the historical chapter, in so far as reasons for events are provided, these are apt to take the form, either of several factors serially listed as having had “something to do with it”, or else of rather bald assertions, as for example that Russian feudalism and serfdom were “in large part the products of early wars” (p. 35). Perhaps it may not be thought captious to add that no mention is made of social differentiation among the peasantry: an omission which, especially in connection with the Stolypin policy of 1906, obscures essentials of the matter which other writers (e.g. Tanquary Robinson) have had the credit of revealing.

The chapters that are richest in factual information are chapters v, vi, vii and x, dealing with the construction of the Plan, industrial administration and

*RUSSIA'S SOVIET ECONOMY. By Harry Schwartz. Foreword by W. H. Chamberlin. (Cape, 36s.)

the price-system, the growth of industrial production, including detailed material about particular products and regions, and the transport system. In several places information is derived from unpublished American Ph.D. theses (on iron and steel and transport). Since such sources are beyond the reviewer's reach, he cannot check, for example, such estimates as the rather surprising calculation (on p. 248) that even in 1932 the armament industry consumed a fifth of the current iron and steel output (and in 1938 nearly a third), or more than the current allocation to railways.

The content of these chapters of factual description gives a sufficiently impressive picture of economic growth and achievement, despite the devastations of two wars and the need for substantial diversion of resources to defence over most of the period since 1917. But this effect the author must needs qualify and offset. So far as heavy industry is concerned, the achievement is frankly admitted: here change has been "spectacular", there has been growth not only in the physical volume but in the *variety* of goods produced, and "industry has been technically transformed, so that by 1950 it was among the most advanced in the world" (p. 202). But as regards consumption goods no such concession is allowed. Here the journalist-propagandist takes charge, and the story runs true to the type of the American propaganda-machine. Of any comparable achievement in consumer goods production the author will not hear, even when the figures which the book cites indicate considerable advances (if smaller than in heavy industry) in this sphere. Apparently, facts must be shaped to the thesis that the achievements in heavy industry have been purchased at the expense of the standard of life of the people (is not this nowadays the stock "Voice of America" line?). As to whether he intends this to mean an *absolute* reduction in the standard of life, the author is not very explicit; but I think there can be little doubt that the effect upon most of his readers will be that this is what he means. (On page 128, however, the claim is the more cautious—almost tautological—one that capital accumulation has been achieved "by restricting the consumption of the Soviet people below what it *might have been*".) If we are to believe this, then it is difficult, indeed, to see how the Soviet Government could have "enlisted the enthusiasm and moral fervour of millions of its subjects", as in one place (p. 532) he is willing to grant that it has done. Mr. Schwartz doubts whether the increase of consumers' goods has exceeded population-increase since pre-revolutionary or pre-Five-Year-Plan days; and he harps on the fact (pp. 251, 254, 360) that shoe production is still sufficient only to provide one pair of shoes per head annually, without mentioning that on his own showing (p. 253) pre-revolutionary shoe output (both factory and handicraft) amounted to scarcely more than one-third of that *per capita* figure. As regards foodstuffs he leans on the suspect "corrections" of crop estimates by Jasny (who makes no bones of his militant anti-Soviet bias); even so these figures show (although he does not relate them directly to population-change) an appreciable *per capita* rise over 1913 for food crops, and also for food crops and livestock products combined. (Needless to say, he does not mention the greater availability, especially of grain, for home consumption owing to much-reduced export as compared with pre-revolutionary days.) In the case of technical crops like sugar-beet, cotton, flax and sunflower seeds, he admits very substantial increases indeed; on potatoes and vegetables he contents himself with the statement that personal consumption is "far below that customary in countries with higher quality diets". Indeed, he seems rather fond of riding away from comparisons with the Russian past when these are favourable by diverting the reader's attention to comparisons with America—a familiar debating trick.

On prices and wages Mr. Schwartz seriously overplays his hand. While admitting that "available data are inadequate to permit the construction of

an over-all index" of prices since 1928, he none the less quotes the familiar (and highly questionable) Prokopovitch price-index, and, combining this with average earnings data to get a real earnings index, reaches the amazing conclusion that the average level of real earnings in 1938 was little more than a half, and in 1948 little more than a third, that of 1928. One is tempted to ask who in that case can have been the consumers of those extra boots and shoes and cloth and sugar? Imagine one's surprise after all this when one reads on page 360 an estimate of the calorie content of the Soviet citizen's diet before the war, and finds this stated at 2,800 calories daily, or higher than the English war-time figure, and only 12 per cent less than the American figure (if with a very much smaller animal protein content). This is a surprising result for a country a substantial part of whose population belongs to Asia. At any rate, an English reader's trust in Mr. Schwartz's calculations and in his sources will not be strengthened if he tries to square them with the recent estimates of clothing and nutritional standards brought back, not only by trade unionists, but also by a business man like Mr. Paul Cadbury.

As regards labour discipline, by running together war-time and peace-time regulations the author builds up to the conclusion that "there is an important element of coercion in all Soviet labour relations" (p. 484). The amazing statement is made that in October 1930 the Commissar of Labour "ordered that all those registered as unemployed be compelled to accept any job offered them", that such pressure brought some millions of housewives into employment "who would probably not have worked" otherwise and was mainly responsible for the rapid increase in the labour force in the course of the '30s (p. 442). On prison labour he is more cautious. While mentioning the notorious Dallin claims, he is careful not to commit himself to them. Nevertheless, while admitting that the evidence is conflicting and that most of it comes from anti-Soviet refugees, who for various reasons can be expected to embroider their stories even if they speak without malice, he leaves upon the reader the impression of an extensive system of forced labour, playing a significant economic role.

Mr. Schwartz will not even allow weight to the argument that war and rearmament have been a major factor in retarding the rise in consumption standards—that, in other words, the enmity of the outside world has been responsible for what he most complains of. This he dismisses with curious sophistry—with an *ignoratio elenchi* argument about the bulk of consumer goods production being located in areas destined to be overrun by the Germans. Sometimes he is guilty, if not of trying to have an argument both ways, of refusing to allow the actions of the Soviet government ever to be right. When they use a price-index with an old base, this is a statistical distortion, cunningly devised to deceive; when in the course of time they decide to replace it with a new one, this is hailed as an admission of guilt (p. 124). *Kolkhozy* are described, of course, as "anything but democratic"; but when the Soviet government is reported as launching a campaign against undemocratic practices, this is called "putting a velvet glove on the iron fist of party control" (p. 280). Among incidental *obiter dicta* is a dogmatic assertion about the planning system that it shows "complete absence of . . . consumers' sovereignty" (p. 167); and the equally dogmatic assertion (without any evidence cited in support) that war-time labour regulation "has been retained and made more stringent up to 1950" (p. 448). One need hardly add that in the penultimate chapter on "Foreign Economic Relations" the account of post-1945 international events follows the conventional American official story, without any pretence of considering "another side". The book will no doubt be extensively used in courses for the American intelligence and political warfare service: a possibility which may well have been in mind when it was being written.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE GREATEST BATTLE OF OUR TIME

WHEN the historians of the future write the history of the intellectual conflicts of this century they will see that the struggle was not for this or that particular idea, but for an entirely new conception of the real world—including both nature and man in society, and the relations between the two.

But, of course, there is nothing “entirely new”. That would be an impossibility, and the names of the architects of this new vision stretch far back into the years, and even centuries—not only Michurin, Pavlov and Timiryazev, but Darwin, Lamarck, Galileo and Copernicus, have had a hand in shaping it. What is new is that in our time what seemed to be separate streams of thought have converged, so that now, instead of seeing individual scientists, each bent over his own researches, we find that from these researches has arisen a new outlook on the real world around us, complete enough for man to live by it, to shape his government, his relations with his fellow men, his daily work, and his own thoughts by it. The great biological controversy lies at the heart of this development because it deals with the very source of life, and man’s power over it.

The author of this book has set out to write a history of natural science in popular language, dealing with the world of green plants around us, with Linnaeus, de Candolle, Lamarck and Darwin, with his own boyhood, with science and agriculture in old Russia, with Michurin and Lysenko, Dokuchayev and Williams, with the siege of Leningrad, and the growing of millet in the Ukraine, with vegetative hybrids and open pollination, cluster planting and afforestation, the making of soil and the re-making of climate. All this is deeply interesting, and could not fail to make an interesting book, but it might have been just a pleasant and informative chat about biology. After all, there is nothing in it that is new. We could read *The Origin of Species* or books on Mendelism at any time, we have the works of Michurin and the verbatim report of the famous session of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR in 1948, in English, and we can get plenty of figures for the yields of wheat and millet on collective farms. But this is a case where the whole is far greater than the sum of its parts. Because every subject the author deals with falls so truly and so clearly into perspective, because he understands the real meaning of the story he has to tell as being a tremendous revo-

lution in human thought, he succeeds in communicating to us his own excitement, and making the book a thrilling and unforgettable one to read. I felt, on finishing it, as if I had been travelling through a vast landscape the existence of which I had only known before through maps.

The author knows that human beings are an integral part of his story, and so the biographical details he gives us are not simply embroideries. He understands very well both the strength and the limitations of Darwin, and he evokes in a few pages a very accurate picture of Victorian England. He is fair to Luther Burbank, a man of great natural skill wasted by a commercial society. He lets us see the true greatness of Michurin, who could say, at sixty, “The years have gone by, and my strength is exhausted” and yet after that could start again, and do what might have been a life’s work for another man; who could say, “My followers must run ahead of me, contradict me, even destroy the fruits of my labour, while at the same time continuing it, for only such consistently destroyed work can promote progress.” He appreciates the burning practical energy of Lysenko, who said, “One must argue with work, not with empty words”, and “To do a big thing, you must be able to do a small one. Do a small thing, it will grow big.” It is quite clear that not only was the work impossible without the men, but the men were made by the work they did. The writer is sensitive to the complex interaction of society, nature and the human mind, so that he shows it as a pattern out of which we could not draw one thread and say, “This is superfluous, it has no real bearing on the subject.”

There is immense interest in this country in the development of Soviet biological theory and practice. But those who try to talk about it are up against a difficulty. There exists very little in our language that is written in non-technical terms, so it is not easy for anyone untrained in biology to grasp what exactly the controversy has all been about. Now in this book it can be read in language full of poetry, and sometimes of irony, but never of technicalities. Writing this way, the author is not able, of course, to bring forward sufficient facts to convince a specialist on purely technical grounds, but those facts can be found in other books, the results tabulated, and chapter and verse given. It is nevertheless amazing how much he has been able to tell in simple language. The ordinary

reader will quite rightly use another test as well—a science that can lead to a view of life and of nature so majestic in its breadth, so full of joy in today and hope in the future, cannot possibly be the creation of men who are either fools or knaves, without any interest in truth, as some of their opponents would have us believe.

DORA SCARLETT

LAND IN BLOOM. By V. Safonov.
(Foreign Languages Publishing House,
Moscow, 7/6.)

SOVIET TRADE UNION PUBLICATIONS

THESE three pamphlets* recently issued in English by the publishing house of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions of the USSR lend themselves to review as a group, although each one is a separate and self-contained publication. The first describes the economic advance of the years 1946-50, the second deals with the part played by the trade unions in bringing about this advance, while the third has for its subject the new projects which have been launched on the basis of this advance.

The title of the first pamphlet is perhaps somewhat misleading for the English reader, as its subject is not the theoretical work of economists but the actual economic developments of the given period. It provides a clear, factual review of progress in the different branches of the national economy. Particular emphasis is laid upon the key importance of heavy industry, which has to produce the means of equipping all the other branches. A higher rate of development was laid down for this branch in the plan for this reason, and its realisation was what made possible fulfilment of their tasks by the other branches, including agriculture. Within the field of agriculture the key position is assigned to grain production, seen as the basis for all the other sections, livestock included. The supply of machines by heavy industry to the rest of industry and to agriculture, and the supply of grain by the grain-producing State and collective farms to the rest of the countryside and to the towns, stand out as the two fundamental economic processes. The pamphlet concludes with an account of

the improvements in the standard of living which have been made as a result of the increased production in 1946-50—abolition of rationing, four substantial price reductions, expansion of health services, and so on.

The second pamphlet explains how the trade unions contributed to accomplishing the thirty-seven per cent increase in the productivity of labour (one per cent more than was planned) which was a feature of the period. Of particular interest is the account given of the rise of new forms of "Stakhanovism" in various industries (notably the movement for high-speed metal machining in the engineering industry), the organisation by the trade unions of "Stakhanovite schools" to spread the experience of the most advanced workers over the whole labour force, and the appearance of "Stakhanovite factories", such as the now-famous Kalibr machine-tool plant in Moscow. The intense interest of the Soviet workers in mastering the technique of their trades and continually raising their qualifications, and the work of the trade unions in facilitating this progress, are illustrated by numerous examples.

This pamphlet can serve as a handy guide to the functioning of the 30,000,000-strong Soviet trade unions, perhaps the most useful so far produced. It is all the more informative because it is set out not abstractly but as an account of the work of these organisations over a definite period. All sides of the trade unions' many-sided activities are described, including factory inspection, social insurance administration and housing control. Exceptionally striking to the "Western" reader is the way in which production tasks and the more familiar trade union tasks of increasing the immediate benefits of members are treated not as two contrasted sides of the trade unions' responsibilities but as all bound up together. "More than 1,200,000 people took part in the discussion at meetings and conferences which examined the draft collective agreements for 1950. The workers submitted a big number of proposals for raising productivity, improving labour conditions, mechanising arduous and labour-consuming jobs and improving cultural and other services."

The last of the three pamphlets opens with an overall account by Academician A. Winter of the great plan for the transformation of nature, with special reference to electric power production. He sets the plan in its historical perspective, tracing the history of power development in Russia, and makes some interesting comparisons with large-scale power schemes in other countries. This is followed by more detailed descriptions of each of the separate schemes (Volga dams, Main Turkmenian Canal, etc.) by Professor

*THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF SOVIET ECONOMICS IN THE FIRST POST-WAR FIVE-YEAR PLAN PERIOD. THE SOVIET TRADE UNIONS DURING THE PERIOD OF THE POST-WAR FIVE-YEAR PLAN. THE GREAT CONSTRUCTION WORKS OF COMMUNISM. (All published by Profizdat, Moscow, 1951.)

T. L. Zolotaryov, who also gives a concise but vivid account of the new machinery (excavators, dredges, etc.) being used on the dam-building and canal-digging sites. The pamphlet is rounded off with brief pieces of reportage by a number of writers who have visited the sites, including Boris Polevoi, which illustrate the spirit and attitude of the workers, both those actually employed on the schemes and those who are producing the machinery, equipment and other supplies for them. They show how the entire people is being drawn into this vast undertaking and how this in turn is having profound effects in the social and cultural spheres.

The pamphlet closes with Polevoi's picture of Victor Mokhov, a collective farm lad who has become famous for his skilled handling of one of the giant scrapers which are being used in the making of the Volga-Don Canal, due to be opened for navigation this spring. "Victor Mokhov's dream of becoming a famous mechanic has become a reality. The other dream of this orphaned son of a Soviet soldier—to become a musician—is also materialising. He has become a fine performer on that instrument of his [an accordion]. Reflecting the historical vicissitudes of this famous spot, the various melodies he plays are a medley of military marches dating back to the Civil War. It was to their tunes that his teacher, the old Red Guard, fought against the White-Guard Cossacks at Tsaritsyn. Intermixed are Stalingrad songs sung by his father, who lost his life in that city's defence. Then, mingled with these are modern Soviet songs extolling the labour and love of our peaceful people. Then, interspersed, follow flashes of new, as yet barely known, melodies whose leitmotif is the great constructions of Communism."

B. L. PEARCE

AN AMERICAN SCHOLAR AMONG THE SLAVS

THIS monograph, one of the Slavic Studies series of Columbia University, deals with a recent period of Russo-Czech literary inter-relationships in a manner bespeaking the interest and painstaking research (much of it done on the spot in Prague) which the author has brought to his subject. One can agree with Professor Jakobson's foreword both when he says, "At first sight such a subject might seem over specialised" and when he points out that "For the history of inter-Slavic cultural relations the Czech nineteenth century is particularly instructive". One can be grateful to Mr. Harkins for the large amount of useful material (rare in English) on one aspect

of those cultural relations which he has collated.

The main impression left by a reading of this book, however, is one of a mass of material, of facts interesting in themselves but not illuminated greatly by the writer, who never gives us any hint of his own assessment and appreciation of the *byliny* from the poetic, historical or any other point of view. He remarks that the Russians of the nineteenth century, "lacking a comprehensive theory of the nature and transmission of folklore, were incompetent to approach the songs of Kirsha Danilov", but he neither outlines any such theory nor tells us where to look for it. And an author cannot be accepted as a helpful guide among trends and outlooks if he permits himself to say (on p. 159): "To be sure, the common ground of these poets was equally great—all were patriotic Pan-Slavists", and then on page 161 "Leger" (one of the poets referred to) "used the *byliny* for reasons quite free from any motivation of patriotism or Pan-Slavism". On the technical side, the analysis of formal devices and rhythms is thorough, but in translated excerpts and phrases the choice of words is sometimes far from happy, even unnecessarily inaccurate.

RUTH KISCH

THE RUSSIAN FOLK EPOS IN CZECH LITERATURE, 1800-1900. By William E. Harkins (*King's Crown Press*; London: *Geoffrey Cumberlege*, 24/-.)

A DESCRIPTIVE GEOGRAPHY

IT is now becoming an accepted dictum that geography is the study of places rather than of men, but it is not usual for the interpretation to be quite so literal as is found in the recent geography of the USSR by Theodore Shabad.* In fairness, the author set himself the specific objective of providing up-to-date, factual information on the location of industry, the status of political-administrative divisions, and the sites of new projects; within these limits the book succeeds. Perhaps it is the title of the work which misleads, for only in the narrow sense can it be considered a regional survey. Even the delimitation of the regions according to present administrative boundaries may be justifiable, but one could legitimately expect that the "personality" of the several regions would be broadly and clearly delineated in a book of some 500 pages. All major geographical regions have a character which is, at one and the same time, a function of place and also something more than the sum of its parts.

*GEOGRAPHY OF THE USSR—A Regional Survey. By Theodore Shabad. (*Oxford University Press and Columbia University Press*, 42/-.)

It results from the interaction of man and land both now and through time.

The work will prove valuable for the reader in search of isolated facts concerned with the location and importance of places. In this respect it is a mine of information. The first ninety pages consist of a brief survey of position, structure, relief, agriculture, industry and transport. The greater part, however, comprises a systematic description of the various republics and their sub-regions. The text is illustrated by fifty-seven maps which are uniform in style, showing the position of the main centres of population, streams, railways and boundaries.

Each region is subjected to similar treatment: a description of the simple physical facts, its people, agriculture, resources and the chief occupations followed in the main towns. Tables are appended which show areas and estimates 1947-population figures for the many administrative sub-divisions. In addition, the book contains a selected bibliography and a comprehensive index.

G. D. B. GRAY

TOO MANY BOGEYS

IN his artistic interpretation of Prokofiev's story the illustrator has had little regard either for the author's intention or for the tender age of the prospective readers. Nothing could be more unlike Prokofiev's gallant Peter than the wan wooden-faced figure of Alan Howard's version. Even the grown-up mind, after duly appreciating the sophisticated charm of the Dantesque wolf, the Germanic huntsmen, the pre-Raphaelite duck and the Oriental flowered meadow, retains mainly the macabre impression of staring eyes, sinister trees and joyless colouring. (And, by the way, the only Russian touch about Peter are the little felt boots which he is, strangely enough, wearing in summer!) As for the very young, for whom the story is intended and who cannot be inured yet to the distortions and ugliness of comic strips and cartoons, they may well be frightened by their very first glimpse of this Peter with his misshapen head, staring eyes and claw-like hand. And they may easily find the wolf less terrifying than the savage cat or the fish-like bird, and especially than the obscene old man who simply could not be anybody's grandfather. So out of tune with the text are the pictures that, if brought to explain them to a youthful audience, I would be tempted to make the story run thus: "There was an unhappy little boy called Peter who lived with a horrible old man who kept him locked up in a cellar. He gave Peter nothing but bread and water, so that Peter became very thin and sickly, and he made him do lots of hard sums, until

Peter's head swelled and swelled. Every time Peter tried to run away the old man caught him and locked him up again." And so on, with at the end the wolf getting himself accidentally caught in the noose Peter had intended for his tormentor, and Peter being rescued by four robbers with whom he makes off into the woods, while the horrible old man swears after them in helpless rage.

The beautifully printed translation of the Russian text is adequate, though one could wish for a happier rendering of some expressions, such as the concluding comment by the grandfather (who, incidentally, does not *toss* his head, but *shakes* it).

T. SHEBUNINA

PETER AND THE WOLF. By Sergei Prokofiev. Illustrated by Alan Howard. (Faber and Faber, 8/6.)

A BATTLE OF GIANTS

EARLY in 1951 a match for the chess championship of the world was played in Moscow between M. Botvinnik, the holder, and D. Bronstein. Out of twenty-four games each scored twelve points, so Botvinnik retained the title which he first won in 1948.

Now two well-known international chess masters, William Winter and R. G. Wade, have written a book on the match.*

Winter gives a survey of previous world championships which, in parts, does not make pleasant reading. In the past there have been many wrangles and much bitter feeling between the contestants, but this should not happen again, as the event is now controlled by the International Chess Federation.

Following a brief chapter on the careers of the players by Winter, there is an account by Wade, who was present throughout the contest, of the many exciting situations which arose in the course of play.

Most of the book, however, is devoted to the games, and these are already known to members of the Anglo-Soviet Chess Circle through the bulletins edited by Winter last summer. Then the notes were by him, but in this book are included analyses by other famous chess masters, both made at the match and published in various Soviet and other chess periodicals.

This book is bound to become a historic record of a great match and can be strongly recommended to all chess players.

J. GILCHRIST

*THE WORLD CHESS CHAMPIONSHIP: BOTVINNIK v. BRONSTEIN. By W. Winter and R. G. Wade. (Turnstile Press, 15/-.)

TWO INTERMEDIATE READERS

Anton Chekhov, Selected Short Stories,* described as the first volume in a new series of Russian readers designed to cater both for elementary and for more advanced students, follows closely the pattern of a previous series that was also under the general editorship of Professor Kononov. The accented text is followed by a section of explanatory notes, a section of idioms and difficult constructions, and a very full and useful vocabulary. While this system exasperated the reviewer (who is only blessed with the normal complement of fingers for holding in cross-references) it is excellent for the student. Used intelligently the book becomes far more than a reader, and enables the student to build up his vocabulary and control of idiom in a very satisfactory way. The notes, the idiom section and the vocabulary are specifically designed to enable the student to incorporate new words and idioms into his own vocabulary, as well as to understand the text.

The notes, which are very full, are a continual reminder that language is a historical process, a fact which compilers of dictionaries so often forget. They contribute, in fact, far more than does the somewhat wooden introduction to an understanding of Chekhov.

The book also makes a valuable contribution to the beginner's study of the language by listing the stress of every noun in the text. This is done by a system of six symbols (fully explained in an introduction to the use of the vocabulary) that enable the student to work out the correct stress in any case in the singular or plural. It is a great pity that the price may limit the use of what will undoubtedly be a very useful class book.

By comparison, *Six Short Stories*,† prepared by the Columbia University Department of Slavonic Languages and edited by Rebecca Domar, is both expensive and inadequate. A book of the "spoon-feeding" type, it presents the student with text and vocabulary concurrently, and therefore offers no incentive to learn words or to infer the meaning from the root before verifying. Notes and vocabulary cannot compare with the Chekhov reader. It does, on the other hand, offer a series of ready-made questions in Russian to test the comprehension of the pupil, and this may recommend it to some teachers, especially in secondary schools. D.G.F.

*ANTON CHEKHOV: SELECTED SHORT STORIES. Edited by G. A. Birkett and Gleb Struve. (*Oxford Russian Readers*, 15/-)

†SIX SHORT STORIES. Selected and edited by Rebecca A. Domar. (*Columbia University Press*; London: *Groffrey Cumberlege*, 21/-)

NIKOLAI GOGOL

Died 1852

✧

Lecture : April 30, 7.30
p.m., Film House,
Wardour Street, W.1.

COMPTON MACKENZIE

With illustrative readings from Gogol's works.

Playreading : May (date and place to be announced).

THE GOVERNMENT INSPECTOR

Article : Summer issue of
*ANGLO - SOVIET
JOURNAL* (Vol. XIII,
No. 2).

**Dr. W.
NEUSCHAFER**

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

BOOKS

- ANTHOLOGY OF NINETEENTH-CENTURY RUSSIAN LITERATURE. Ed. C. A. Manning. (*King's Crown Press and O.U.P.*, 12/6.)
- CHEKHOV THE DRAMATIST. D. Magarshack. (*John Lehmann*, 21/-.)
- DATELINE MOSCOW. D. Dallas. (*Heinemann*, 21/-.)
- EAST OF STETTIN-TRIESTE. Stanley Evans. (*Fore Publications*, 5/-.)
- HERBERT HOOVER AND THE RUSSIAN PRISONERS OF WORLD WAR I. E. F. Willis. (*Stanford U.P. and O.U.P.*, 12/-.)
- NIKOLAI GOGOL: A CENTENARY SURVEY. Janko Lavrin. (*Sylvan Press*, 12/6.)
- OXFORD SLAVONIC PAPERS. Vol. II. Ed. S. Kononov. (*Clarendon Press*, 12/6.)
- READINGS IN RUSSIAN HISTORY. Ed. L. Stilman. (*Columbia U.P. and O.U.P.*, 6/6.)
- RUSSIAN OPERA. Martin Cooper. (*Parrish*, 7/6.)
- SOVIET CIVIL LAW, Vols. I & II. V. Gsovski. (*Geoffrey Cumberlege*, two vols. 120/-.)
- THE BOLSHEVIK REVOLUTION, 1917-1923, Vol. II. E. H. Carr. (*Macmillan*, 30/-.)
- THE PROUD AND THE FREE. Howard Fast. (*The Bodley Head*, 12/6.)
- THE ROAD TO LIFE. Anton Makarenko. (*Collet's*, 3 vols., 12/6.)
- THE RUSSIAN-AMERICAN COMPANY. S. B. Okun. (*Harvard U.P. and O.U.P.*, 30/-.)
- THE SEAGULL PRODUCED BY STANISLAVSKI. S. D. Balukhaty, tr. D. Magarshack. (*Dennis Dobson*, 21/-.)

PAMPHLETS

- DISARMAMENT. J. D. Bernal. (*British Peace Committee*, 6d.)
- FREEDOM OF RELIGION IN THE SOVIET UNION. G. Spasov. (*Soviet News*, 2d.)
- INDIA WELCOMES SOVIET ARTISTS. (*People's Publishing House, Bombay*, 8 annas.)
- MILITARY AIRCRAFT OF THE USSR. C. W. Cain and D. J. Voaden. (*Herbert Jenkins*, 3/6.)

JOURNALS

- CONCERN. No. 2, Jan. 1952. (*Harold Silver*, 1/-.)
- ENGLISH, Vol. VIII, No. 48, Autumn 1951. (*Cumberlege*, 3/6.)
- MASSES AND MAINSTREAM, Dec. 1951, Jan., Feb. 1952. (*New Century*, 35 cents.)
- MODERN QUARTERLY, Vol. 7, No. 2, Spring 1952. (*Lawrence and Wishart*, 2/6.)
- NEW WORLD REVIEW, Nov. 1951. (*SRT Publications*, 25 cents.)
- POLITICAL AFFAIRS, Dec. 1951, Jan., Feb. 1952. (*New Century*, 25 cents.)
- SLAVONIC AND EAST EUROPEAN REVIEW, Vol. XXX, No. 74, Dec. 1951. (*School of Slavonic Studies*, 12/6.)
- THE SCHOOL LIBRARIAN, Vol. 5, No. 6, Dec. 1951. (*School Library Association*, 3/-.)
- TREES AND THE NEW EARTH, Spring 1952. (*Men of the Trees*; unpriced.)

CORRECTION

The review of R. Hare's book, PIONEERS OF RUSSIAN SOCIAL THOUGHT (O.U.P. 25/-), in our last issue, p. 43, suggests in its final paragraph that there is only one plate in the book. In fact the book contains eight full-page *portraits* inserted in the text, as well as the *frontispiece* which the reviewer had in view. We regret this error.

SCR NOTES

LONDON MEETINGS AND OTHER EVENTS

December 1951—March 1952

(All at 14 Kensington Square unless otherwise stated)

December 1951

- 10th : Tape-recording recital. Prokofiev. *Winter Bonfire*. Discussion led by Edward Clark. **Music Section.**
- 12th : Films. *Programme of colour cartoons*. At Crown Theatre. **Students' Group.**
- 17th : Film. *Cavalier of the Gold Star*. At 18 Kensington Palace Gardens, by courtesy of the Soviet Embassy. **Film Section and Writers' Group.**
- 18th : *Annual General Meeting*, **Writers' Group.**
- 31st : **NEW YEAR'S EVE PARTY.**

January 1952

- 7th : Chess match. Anglo-Soviet Chess Circle v. Hampstead.
- 12th : *The Teaching of Russian History in British Schools*. Lecture by Diana Sinott. Chair : R. W. Davies. **History Committee.**
- 13th : **MAN CONQUERS NATURE : The New Soviet Construction Schemes.** Symposium. Dr. S. M. Manton, FRS ; Prof. J. D. Bernal, FRS ; F. Le Gros Clark ; J. Dunman ; Eleanor Fox ; Brian Pearce ; Ewart Milne (reading his poem from *Anglo-Soviet Journal*, Vol. XII, No. 2). At Battersea Town Hall, S.W.11. (See outside back cover.)
- 20th : Reading of children's play. *Craftsmen's City*, by T. Gabbe. *Producer* : Derek Birch. **Theatre Section.**
- 29th : Tape-recording recital. S. Taktakishvili, *1st Symphony*. Discussion led by Bernard Stevens. Chair : D. T. Richnell. **Music Section.**
- 30th : Film. *Ivan the Terrible*. At Crown Theatre. **Students' Group.**
- 31st : Film. *Donets Miners*. At 18 Kensington Palace Gardens, by courtesy of the Soviet Embassy. **Film Section.**

February 1952

- 11th : Recital by Alan Loveday (violin) and Leonard Cassini (pianoforte). Prokofiev, *Sonata No. 2* ; Ireland, *Sonata No. 2 in A minor* ; Beethoven, *Sonata in A major*, op. 47. **Music Section.**
- 20th : Film. *Mussorgsky*. At Crown Theatre. **Students' Group.**

March 1952

- 4th : Discussion on P. Pavlenko's novel, *Happiness*. Opened by Montagu Slater and Eleanor Fox. Chair : James MacGibbon. (This is the first in a series of discussions on the monthly choices of the *Russia Today Book Club*.) **Writers' Group.**
- 10th : **EXHIBITION OF SOVIET CHILDREN'S TOYS, BOOKS AND PAINTINGS.** Official opening by Dame Sybil Thorndike.

Some Activities of the Sections and Departments

THE most interesting event of this period was the symposium-meeting on **MAN CONQUERS NATURE** at Battersea Town Hall on January 13, when a thousand people formed a most attentive audience for a series of excellent papers on the new Soviet construction schemes. These papers have since been published in pamphlet form, and readers are urged to acquire copies not only for themselves but for their friends.

Chess Section : A series of excellent Bulletins (Nos. 36, 37, and 38) on the XIXth

Championship of the USSR has been issued to members; further copies are available. In the second round of the National Club Championship, the Section's team was defeated by Hampstead.

Education Section: Work has continued on the *Exhibition of English Education* to be sent to the USSR in May, as well as on the *Exhibition of Soviet Children's Toys, Books and Paintings* opened in London in March.

Music Section: Regular recitals of Soviet tape-recordings have been held, and transcripts of the discussions on new Soviet works have been sent to the Union of Soviet Composers.

Theatre Section: The reading of *Craftsmen's City* (with a cast including Alfie Bass, Betty Linton, Anne de Lacy, Millie Bayntun, George Bishop, Oliver Burt, Donald Bisset and Glyn Davys, produced by Derek Birch) was an outstanding success, as the following extracts from reviews bear witness. "... the absorbed attention ... at this attractive presentation confirmed the impression that *Craftsmen's City* is thoroughly good children's theatre."—TIMES EDUCATIONAL SUPPLEMENT. "... full of delightful fancies ... excellently done and genuinely entertaining ... particularly good character work came from Millie Bayntun ... and Alfie Bass. ..."—STAGE

Writers' Group: Mr. Compton Mackenzie has accepted the Presidency of the Group, and Professor C. L. Wrenn has been elected Chairman. The Group has made Associate Membership available to those who, though not professional writers, are interested in Russian and Soviet literature. A series of discussions on the *Russia Today Book Club* monthly choices has been planned, and the centenary of the death of Gogol is being commemorated with a lecture by Mr. Compton Mackenzie on April 30, and a reading of *The Government Inspector* in May.

New Sections in process of formation include *History and Archaeology; Medicine; Social Sciences*. Those interested are asked to communicate with the Secretary.

PROVINCIAL ACTIVITIES: Arrangements for setting up SCR Committees in the main University towns, and for the various outside-London activities outlined in our last issue, are proceeding rapidly, and our next issue will contain a full report on these.

EXHIBITION OF SOVIET CHILDREN'S TOYS BOOKS PAINTINGS

Buckets and doll's-house furniture have beautifully painted floral designs.
—DAILY TELEGRAPH.

With all the roguish innocence of Beatrix Potter's Mrs. Tiggy Winkle, the plush Soviet hedgehog ... stands on a little shelf between two pretty girl dolls in Russian national costume. ... Russian children's painting shows a high standard of technique, colour sense, and composition.—DAILY MAIL.
Teddy bears ... are shown to be as popular in Asia as in the Western world. A model railway ... would amuse British fathers as well as Russian. ... All of the toys are very well made. ... With them also are picture books with high standards in both illustration and printing. For older children there are translations from British authors—Shakespeare's *Sonnets*, Stevenson's *Treasure Island*, etc.—THE SCOTSMAN.

What books do Russian children read and what toys do they play with? ... The books included Russian versions of ... *Robinson Crusoe*, *Gulliver's Travels*, *Treasure Island*, and *Tom Sawyer*. The toys ... included a celluloid duck, a plastic sports car (with a real plush seat), a miniature radio set. ... —DAILY GRAPHIC.

The exhibition may be borrowed from the SCR in whole or in part.
Please apply to the SCR Exhibition Department for details.

SCR DUPLICATED DOCUMENTS AND OTHER TRANSLATIONS AND SURVEYS

(for complete list apply to SCR)

- Education:** Recent Changes in the Teaching of the Russian Language in Soviet Schools; survey article by Eric Hartley (March 1952). SCR Education Bulletin No. 11 1/- (6d.)
- Law:** The Principles of Soviet Insurance Law. SCR Legal Bulletin No. 23 1/- (6d.)
- Literature:** N. V. Gogol: a Soviet view (also Bibliography of English translations of Gogol; news of Soviet Writers). SCR Writers' Bulletin No. 1 1/- (6d.)
- Music:** Symphony No. 1 by Georgian composer S. Taktakishvili. SCR Discussion. SCR Music Bulletin No. 11 6d. (4d.)

PSYCHOLOGY AND PSYCHIATRY

- Ananiev, B. G.** (Psy. 5): Basic tasks of Soviet Psychological Science. (Lecture delivered October 27, 1950.) 3/- (2/-)
- Bykov, K. M.** (Pav. 3): Development of the ideas of I. P. Pavlov. Opening statement at the Joint Session of the Academy of Sciences and the Academy of Medical Sciences of the USSR, June 28, 1950 5/- (3/6)
- Bykov, K. M.** (Pav. 4): Developments of Pavlovian Physiology. Report to meeting organised by Science Councils of Pavlov Institute of Physiology, the Institute of Experimental Medicine and Sechonov Physiological Society of Leningrad, to discuss the results of the Session on Problems of Pavlov Physiology held in 1950 3 - (2/-)
- Chernakov, E. T.** (Psy. 2): Against Idealism and Metaphysics in Psychology (from "Voprosy filosofii," 1948, No. 3) 3/- (2/-)
- Kirman, B. H.** (Pav. 2): The Application of Conditioned Reflexes to Psychiatry 2/6 (1/6)
- Leontyev, A. N.** (Psy. 4): Important Tasks of Soviet Psychology in the light of the (August 1948) Session of the Academy of Agricultural Sciences (from "Sov. Pedagogika," 1949, No. 1) 1/6 (1/-)
- McPherson, A. S.** (Pav. 1): Recent Advances in Conditioned Reflexes 2/6 (1/6)
- ANGLO-SOVIET JOURNAL**
- Kirman, B. H.** (ASJ x, 3): The Influence of Pavlov's Work on Psychiatry 2/6
- Kirman, B. H.** (ASJ xi, 1): A Note on Idealism in Psychology) 2/6
- Shmarnyan, A. S.** (ASJ ix, 2): Thirty Years of Soviet Psychiatry (from "Nevropatologiya in Psikhatriya," 1947, No. 5) 2/6
- Teplov, B. M.** (ASJ xi, 3): Contribution on Psychology to the Pavlov discussions at the Academy of Sciences discussion, July 1950) 2/6

Prices in brackets are those for SCR members. Please quote reference numbers when ordering.

MAN CONQUERS NATURE

Text of six speeches at the SCR symposium—on January 13, 1952, at the Battersea Town Hall—on the great new Soviet construction schemes, covering economic, agricultural, nutritional, biological, and social aspects and implications of these afforestation-irrigation-electrification works which are wholly transforming the climate, landscape and economy of an area larger than Europe.

Prof. J. D. Bernal,
F.R.S.

Dr. S. M. Manton,
F.R.S.

F. Le Gros Clark,
M.A.

Brian Pearce,
B.A.

Eleanor Fox

Jack Dunman

With map and bibliography

1/-

Single copies post 3d.

From

S C R

14 Kensington Square, London, W.8

Printed by Letchworth Printers Ltd., Letchworth, Herts